

Henry E. Crews to be postmaster at Edwight, W. Va. Office became presidential October 1, 1924.

Roscoe C. Damron to be postmaster at Branchland, W. Va. Office became presidential October 1, 1924.

Harry M. Slush to be postmaster at Whitesville, W. Va. Office became presidential October 1, 1924.

James H. Reid to be postmaster at Slab Fork, W. Va. Office became presidential July 1, 1924.

John S. Walker to be postmaster at Sharples, W. Va. Office became presidential October 1, 1924.

Millard M. Mason to be postmaster at Seth, W. Va. Office became presidential April 1, 1924.

J. Wade Bell to be postmaster at Quinwood, W. Va. Office became presidential October 1, 1924.

Clifton M. Spangler to be postmaster at Peterstown, W. Va. Office became presidential October 1, 1924.

Andrew B. Canterbury to be postmaster at Pax, W. Va. Office became presidential October 1, 1924.

William W. Wolfe to be postmaster at Mount Clare, W. Va. Office became presidential October 1, 1924.

Joseph W. Thornbury to be postmaster at Man, W. Va. Office became presidential October 1, 1923.

Ora E. Gay to be postmaster at Libow, W. Va. Office became presidential October 1, 1924.

Blanche P. Reed to be postmaster at Clay, W. Va., in place of Buren Stephenson. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1924.

WYOMING

Maxwell L. Jourdan to be postmaster at Medicine Bow, Wyo., in place of M. A. Jourdan, resigned.

Burton R. Jones to be postmaster at Greybull, Wyo., in place of Roy Shaver, resigned.

John G. Bruce to be postmaster at Lander, Wyo., in place of F. E. Godfrey. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1924.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, December 3, 1924

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our Lord, holy, holy, holy is Thy name, and righteousness is the habitation of Thy throne. We would cherish that greatest of gifts, the mercy of a grateful heart. We praise Thee for the things that gladden and enrich our lives, for all are of Thy bounty. As Thy children, Thou dost understand us. So discipline us that our defects and excesses shall yield a more complete perfection and greater usefulness. Amid this sweet stillness, forgive us while we bow and have mercy upon us when we are judged in the light of Thy throne. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9559) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes.

Resolved, That the Senate recedes from its amendments Nos. 29 and 34.

The message also announced that the Senate had concurred in the following resolution:

House Concurrent Resolution 30

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Monday, the 15th day of December, 1924, be set aside as the day upon which there shall be held a joint session of the Senate and the House of Representatives for appropriate exercises in commemoration of the life, character, and public service of the late Woodrow Wilson, former President of the United States.

That a joint committee, to consist of five Senators and seven Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, respectively, shall be named, with full power to make all arrangements and publish a suitable program for the joint session of Congress herein authorized, and to issue the invitations hereinafter mentioned.

That invitations shall be extended to the President of the United States, the members of the Cabinet, the Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, and such other invitations shall be issued as to the said committee shall seem best.

That all expenses incurred by the committee in the execution of the provisions of this resolution shall be paid, one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROSENBLOOM, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 9559. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3537. An act for the relief of L. A. Scott.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LONGWORTH and Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee appeared, and

Mr. LONGWORTH said: Mr. Speaker, your committee, which was appointed to join a similar committee from the Senate to advise the President that a quorum of the two Houses was present and ready to receive any communication he desired to make, has performed that duty. The President advised the joint committee that he will submit in writing his regular message.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

A message, in writing, from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following message from the President of the United States.

Mr. William Tyler Page, Clerk of the House of Representatives, read the message from the President of the United States, as follows:

[For message, see proceedings of Senate, p. 52.]

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the message will be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

There was no objection.

THE COWLITZ TRIBE OF INDIANS

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 71, an act authorizing the Cowlitz Tribe of Indians, residing in the State of Washington, to submit claims to the Court of Claims, disagree to all the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 71, disagree to all the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. SNYDER, Mr. DALLINGER, and Mr. HAYDEN.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10020) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, and for other purposes; and pending that motion I ask unanimous consent that the time for general debate be limited to six hours, if that is agreeable to my friend from Oklahoma, three hours to be controlled by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER] and three hours by myself.

Mr. CARTER. That would be satisfactory.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the Interior Department appropriation bill, and pending that asks unanimous consent that the time for general debate be limited to six hours, three hours to be controlled by himself and three hours by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The motion of Mr. CRAMTON was then agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. SANDERS of Indiana in the chair.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, in August the President said, "I am for economy, and after that I am for more economy." However we may disagree as to many matters that were or were not decided at the recent election we must all agree that that declaration of the President has met with universal approval. [Applause.]

In the able and fearless and thoroughly sane presentation of affairs touching the state of the Union to which we have just listened, through the reading of the President's message, there stands out prominently that same declaration. The President has emphasized that this Congress can accomplish more for the people of the country through rigid economy than through any other action; that no person in the country escapes the effect of unnecessary expenditure or of extravagance; that every person shares in the benefits of reduction of taxes; and that the most important work we have is to make possible tax reduction. In the beginning of my remarks upon this first appropriation bill to receive the consideration of this session of the Congress I wish to emphasize that intimate relationship between expenditures authorized by appropriations and tax reduction. Tax reduction is not possible without reduction of expenditures. We ask your support in the economy program set forth in these appropriation measures.

Recognizing that this is the short session of Congress, with 11 appropriation bills to be considered, realizing that a due regard for efficient conduct of the Government as well as proper economy in expenditure demands the careful consideration of these matters, the forceful and energetic chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. MADDEN] arranged a schedule and started the various subcommittees to work on the several bills as early as advance proofs of the Budget estimates were available, and it is his purpose and the program of the committee, acting under his leadership, to bring these bills before you as rapidly as the House can dispose of them.

Accordingly, this, the first of the series, was reported to the House yesterday immediately after the formal presentation of the Budget.

Hearings began on the bill now before you on the 12th of November, in advance of the session, and the time since that date has been constantly occupied by the subcommittee in consideration of the estimates transmitted by the President.

A majority of the subcommittee have been in the study of these matters as members of the subcommittee for the past three years in the framing of the three former bills for this department.

My colleague, Mr. CARTER, ranking minority member of the subcommittee, as you know, formerly served a number of years with distinction as chairman of the great Committee on Indian Affairs, handling the appropriations for that service which are now so largely a part of this bill. The gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] and the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] have spent most of their lives in contact with these problems in our western country. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MURPHY] and I have been students at their feet.

COMPARATIVE FIGURES ON THE BILL

So that this bill does not come before you with slight consideration even though it is presented in the first week of the session. The bill carries all of the appropriations for the Interior Department and nothing else. The appropriations for that department for the current year, including those set forth in the deficiency bill that has just gone to the President and in the classification salary bill, totals \$268,959,114.80. In the estimates I speak only of the annual appropriations, with no reference to the permanent or indefinite appropriations. The estimates for 1926 are \$239,704,138.67. The bill that is now before you for your consideration totals \$238,240,926. That is a reduction of \$30,718,188.80 below the current year and \$1,463,212.67 below the estimate. Comparing the bill before you with the current year, the principal reductions are, for Army and Navy pensions, \$25,500,000; a reduction of \$4,297,520 for the Reclamation Service, \$1,046,011.80 for the Indian Service, and \$617,010 under the General Land Office. The following table presents a general view of the bill:

A comparative statement of the appropriations for 1925, the Budget estimates for 1926, and the amounts recommended in the accompanying bill for 1926

Object	Appropriations for 1925, including amounts in pending deficiency and field classification bills	Budget estimates for 1926	Amount recommended in the bill for 1926	Increase (+) or decrease (-), bill compared with 1925 appropriation	Increase (+) or decrease (-), bill compared with 1926 Budget estimates
Secretary's Office.....	\$1,691,440.00	\$1,826,255.00	\$1,779,255.00	+\$67,815.00	-\$47,000.00
General Land Office.....	3,200,600.00	2,583,590.00	2,583,590.00	-617,010.00	
Indian Affairs, Bureau of.....	12,929,281.80	12,377,027.67	11,883,270.00	-1,046,011.80	-493,757.67
Pension Office.....	224,616,000.00	199,116,000.00	199,095,000.00	-25,521,000.00	-21,000.00
Patent Office.....	2,810,600.00	2,765,220.00	2,801,600.00	-\$4,000.00	+\$36,380.00
Bureau of Reclamation.....	18,240,520.00	9,769,000.00	8,943,000.00	-4,297,520.00	-826,000.00
Geological Survey.....	1,735,423.00	1,654,595.00	1,637,760.00	-97,663.00	-16,835.00
Mines, Bureau of.....	2,013,268.00	1,876,560.00	1,881,560.00	-131,708.00	+\$5,000.00
National Park Service.....	2,882,657.00	3,170,909.00	3,187,409.00	+\$204,752.00	+\$16,500.00
Education, Bureau of.....	795,115.00	794,485.00	794,485.00	+\$630.00	
Government in the Territories and Alaska Railroad.....	1,307,510.00	2,210,157.00	1,908,637.00	+\$401,127.00	-\$301,500.00
St. Elizabeths Hospital.....	1,008,000.00	1,023,000.00	1,023,000.00	+\$15,000.00	
Columbia Institution for the Deaf.....	109,000.00	113,400.00	113,400.00	+\$4,400.00	
Howard University.....	365,000.00	221,000.00	408,000.00	+\$143,000.00	+\$185,000.00
Freedmen's Hospital.....	174,700.00	202,950.00	202,950.00	+\$28,250.00	
Grand total, Department of the Interior.....	268,959,114.80	239,704,138.67	238,240,926.00	-\$30,718,188.80	-\$1,463,212.67

This department is a great constructive department. Its problems are of great interest to the whole country. There are many matters that I would like to discuss, but in the limited time that I feel proper to take now I shall speak especially of some outstanding problems that faced the committee. I want to be perfectly courteous, and if I fail to make myself clear at any time I shall be glad to yield for a correction or for an inquiry, but in the main I hope that I may be permitted to proceed without interruption in the interest of economy of time.

The matters that I want especially to speak about have to do with steps toward economy in Government administration and steps to protect Government expenditures with regard to their proper use to secure the greatest benefit of the country. These problems are intimately involved in the program of economy that the President has set before us and that the country urgently demands. I hope that the House will regard the Committee on Appropriations in connection with this bill as their servants who have sought merely in the work we have done and now place before you to carry into effect the will of the country for the best administration, the greatest efficiency, and the greatest measure of economy.

ECONOMY IN THE GENERAL LAND OFFICE

I shall first discuss some problems in respect to the General Land Office. That great bureau administers our public lands. It handles very considerable revenues, as is shown here:

Statement of receipts, including fees and commissions, for the General Land Office for the fiscal year 1924

Salaries, General Land Office (copies of records).....	\$14,893.97
Salaries and expenses, offices of surveyors general (copies of records).....	5,590.50
Surveying the public lands (sales of Government property).....	603.36
Reproducing plats of surveys, General Land Office (sales of plats).....	4,373.00
Sales of public lands.....	551,839.06
Sales of Indian lands.....	359,088.97
Fees and commissions.....	684,650.98
Royalties, rentals, and bonuses, mineral leasing act.....	13,631,840.72
Sales of land and timber in Oregon and California railroad grant.....	878,710.78
Sales of land and timber in Coos Bay wagon road grant.....	148,761.69
Sales of reclamation town sites.....	8,607.32
Sales of town lots, Alaska.....	5,975.12
Royalties on coal leases, Alaska.....	6,161.83
Sales of timber, Alaska.....	8,930.58
Royalties and rentals, potash deposits.....	5,792.91

Power permits.....	\$9,110.61
Miscellaneous.....	25,223.57
Protecting public lands, timber, etc., as follows:	
Timber trespasses.....	\$25,349.07
By civil and criminal action in cases of depredations on public lands and violations of public land laws.....	30,924.02
	56,273.09
Total.....	16,403,928.06
Deduct amount recovered by Department of Justice by civil and criminal action in cases of depredations on public lands and violations of public land laws.....	30,924.02
Total receipts collected by the General Land Office.....	16,373,004.04

A comparative statement of the appropriations for 1925, the Budget estimates for 1926, and the amounts recommended in the accompanying bill for 1926

Object	Appropriations for 1925, including amounts in pending deficiency and field classification bills	Budget estimates for 1926	Amount recommended in the bill for 1926	Increase (+) or decrease (-), bill compared with 1925 appropriation
Salaries.....	\$885,920.00	\$805,000.00	\$805,000.00	-\$80,920.00
Inspection, expenses of.....	5,000.00	3,000.00	3,000.00	-2,000.00
Maps:				
United States and other.....	18,000.00	15,000.00	15,000.00	-3,000.00
State and Territorial.....	1,500.00	1,300.00	1,300.00	-200.00
Filing appliances.....	3,000.00			-3,000.00
Surveyors general.....	214,680.00			-214,680.00
Surveying public lands.....	792,820.00	840,290.00	840,290.00	+47,470.00
Reproducing plats of surveys.....	5,000.00	6,000.00	6,000.00	+1,000.00
Registers and receivers.....	315,000.00	125,000.00	125,000.00	-190,000.00
Contingent expenses of land offices.....	415,280.00	350,000.00	350,000.00	-65,280.00
Protecting public lands, timber, etc.....	526,400.00	420,000.00	420,000.00	-106,400.00
Hearings in land entries.....	15,000.00	15,000.00	15,000.00	
Restoration of lands in forest reserves.....	2,000.00	2,000.00	2,000.00	
Opening Indian reservations (reimbursable).....	1,000.00	1,000.00	1,000.00	
Total, General Land Office.....	3,290,600.00	2,583,590.00	2,583,590.00	-617,010.00

The total appropriations for the Land Office in 1925, the current year, were \$3,200,600. In the bill before you we recommend the sum of \$2,583,590, a reduction of \$617,010, or about 20 per cent. Within the control of the bureau are certain economies, which they have resolutely carried through. Take their salary roll, for instance, for the service in the city of Washington. It is sometimes charged that a department or a bureau will never do away with employees or reduce their rolls. Please note that the Land Office was authorized for 1924 for their service here in Washington 545 employees and for the current year 488 employees. Yet, notwithstanding that authorization, they are going to turn back this year of that fund \$70,000 unexpended. For 1926, 418 employees are authorized in this bill, a reduction of 127 from 1924 to 1926, or about 25 per cent. That is within their authority, and no assistance is required from Congress to accomplish that economy.

ABOLISHING LAND OFFICES

But there are some items where the assistance of Congress is necessary, and this committee has accepted the recommendations of the department with reference to those economies that they desire and in which they require the cooperation of Congress. I appeal to this House to give thorough support to the program of economy recommended by the General Land Office. There is involved in the matter, first, the question of abolishing numerous land offices, a question that has been discussed in past years and which this committee has for several years sought to accomplish as a measure of economy. The bill before you provides:

Registers: For salaries and commissions of registers of district land offices, at not exceeding \$3,000 per annum each, \$125,000: *Provided*, That the offices of register and receiver of such of the following land offices as may now have two officials shall be consolidated, effective July 1, 1925, and the applicable provisions of the act approved October 28, 1921, shall be followed in effecting such consolidations: Montgomery, Ala.; Anchorage, Fairbanks, and Nome, Alaska; Phoenix, Ariz.; Little Rock, Ark.; Los Angeles, Sacramento, San Francisco, and Visalia, Calif.; Denver, Glenwood Springs, Montrose, and Pueblo, Colo.; Gainesville, Fla.; Boise and Lewiston, Idaho; Baton Rouge, La.; Marquette, Mich.; Cass Lake, Minn.; Havre, Helena, Miles City, and Missoula, Mont.; Lincoln, Nebr.; Carson City, Nev.; Las Cruces, Roswell, and Santa Fe, N. Mex.; Bismarck, N. Dak.; Guthrie, Okla.; Lakeview, Portland, Roseburg, The Dalles, and Vale, Oreg.; Pierre and Rapid City, S. Dak.; Salt Lake City, Utah; Seattle and Spokane, Wash.; and Buffalo, Douglas, Evanston, and Lander, Wyo.: *Provided further*, That the following land offices are hereby abolished, effective July 1, 1925: Harrison, Ark.; El Centro, Eureka, Independence, and

The bureau presents a program of expenditures that represents a total reduction of 20 per cent in the entire cost of the bureau for the year 1926 as compared with 1925. That reduction is recommended by the bureau; it is recommended by the Secretary of the Interior, is recommended by the Budget and by the President of the United States. That is real economy, and so thoroughly has the committee appreciated that program as a real exemplification of what we have all been talking about in the campaign, viz, economy, that we have recommended the adoption of their estimates as they came to us in the Budget, making no change. The following table presents vividly this example of real retrenchment:

Susanville, Calif.; Del Norte, Durango, Lamar, Leadville, and Sterling, Colo.; Blackfoot, Coeur d'Alene, and Halley, Idaho; Topeka, Kans.; Crookston and Duluth, Minn.; Jackson, Miss.; Billings, Bozeman, Glasgow, Great Falls, Kalispell, and Lewistown, Mont.; Alliance, Nebr.; Elko, Nev.; Clayton and Fort Sumner, N. Mex.; Dickinson, N. Dak.; Burns and La Grande, Oreg.; Bellefourche, S. Dak.; Vernal, Utah; Vancouver, Walla Walla, Waterville, and Yakima, Wash.; Wausau, Wis.; Cheyenne and Newcastle, Wyo., and their necessary personnel, together with such records, furniture, and supplies as may be necessary, shall be transferred to such of the land offices enumerated above and not abolished by this act as the Secretary of the Interior may direct, except that the records of the Topeka, Kans., Jackson, Miss., and Wausau, Wis., land offices shall be disposed of in accordance with existing law.

That means the abolition of 39 land offices and the abolition of the office of receiver at all other land offices, continuing those other offices in charge of a register only. These economies mean a saving of \$255,280, as follows:

	1925	1926
For registers and receivers (Interior bill).....	\$315,000	\$125,000
Field classification.....	60,280	
Contingent expenses.....	355,000	350,000
Total appropriations.....	730,280	475,000
Saving proposed.....		255,280

Please note that that change has the indorsement of the Commissioner of the General Land Office, Mr. Spry, a former Governor of the State of Utah, and of Doctor Work, the Secretary of the Interior, both from public-land States and well informed in respect to the problems of those States. It also has the indorsement of the President as a part of his economy program. I insert here a statement from the hearings, being that of Mr. Bond, the chief clerk of the General Land Office, who is probably as familiar with this question from a practical standpoint as anyone, because he has spent his life in the general land service and formerly was in a general land office, I think, in Montana or Wyoming. When asked about the effect of this reduction upon the service to the public Mr. Bond said that he was asked by the Budget Committee about that and told them that in his judgment it is a good administrative proposition, and he said that the public would not be adversely affected as to the service rendered to them. The following excerpts from his testimony before the committee will be of interest:

Statement showing district land offices proposed to be abolished, number of officials, acreage unappropriated, and unreserved lands and acreage embraced in unperfected entries, as of July 1, 1924; and entries made, entries perfected, receipts, and expenses during fiscal year ended June 30, 1924—Continued

States and offices	Statement as of July 1, 1924		Entries made, entries perfected, receipts, and expenses during fiscal year ended June 30, 1924											Ex- penses above re- ceipts	Rela- tion of ex- pense to revenue
			Number of applications, entries, etc. (original and final)	Original en- tries	Final proofs made; entries per- fected	Pat- ented	Receipts				Expenses				
	Unappropri- ated and un- reserved	Unper- fected entries					Indian lands	Public lands (in- cluding receipts from oil, coal, timber, etc.)	Miscella- neous (includ- ing fees and com- missions)	Total	Salaries and com- missions, registers and re- ceivers	Clerk hire, rent, and other inciden- tals	Total		
	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>		<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>									<i>P. ct.</i>
Kansas: Topeka*†	2,038	28,987	98	5,067	8,797	11,487	\$200.00	\$150.00	\$1,029.76	\$1,379.76	\$1,153.76	\$1,932.50	\$3,086.26	\$1,706.50	223.68
Minnesota:															
Crookston*†	121,114	46,070	30	434	1,799	10,946	10,251.98	698.58	2,566.44	13,517.00	2,045.46	1,310.00	3,355.46		24.82
Duluth*†	39,928	38,780	170	4,212	4,392	8,984	5,214.17	4,110.02	1,673.57	10,997.76	1,095.94	1,864.75	3,560.69		32.28
Mississippi: Jackson*†	18,546	14,840	144	3,659	3,788	14,431		6,972.74	1,251.50	8,224.24	1,583.94	3,034.04	4,617.98		56.15
Montana:															
Billings*†	253,570	207,689	122	14,998	11,977	30,811	30,321.36	2,031.54	3,075.62	35,428.55	3,000.00	3,675.37	6,675.37		18.84
Bozeman*†	161,156	165,452	304	31,797	32,381	41,431		3,725.00	4,775.56	8,500.56	4,769.38	1,826.50	6,595.88		77.59
Glasgow*	1,381,005	694,433	750	75,188	106,967	164,415	94,214.65	5,273.37	11,701.69	111,189.71	6,000.00	8,110.06	14,110.06		12.69
Great Falls*†	146,392	236,882	326	22,057	41,823	49,004		3,584.12	4,264.83	7,848.95	3,000.00	4,219.61	7,219.61		91.98
Kalispell*†	32,620	20,837	118	6,001	8,817	14,516	1,585.67	247.61	1,307.58	3,200.86	1,552.90	1,391.85	2,944.75		92.00
Lewistown†	535,545	299,316	322	22,759	54,789	68,286		221,836.78	5,168.57	227,005.35	6,000.00	6,667.07	12,667.07		5.58
Nebraska:															
Allamore*†	16,336	84,679	139	8,856	19,538	23,155		1,104.22	1,504.23	2,608.45	1,646.31	1,303.86	2,950.17	341.72	113.1
Nevada:															
Elko†	18,474,537	149,246	187	46,635	23,007	157,377		8,737.66	3,652.01	12,389.76	3,000.00	2,719.61	5,719.61		46.16
New Mexico:															
Clayton†	63,254	247,816	497	32,265	84,313	88,836		343.37	6,316.95	6,660.32	6,000.00	4,113.76	10,113.76	3,453.44	151.85
Fort Sumner†	528,220	483,242	575	109,992	90,293	101,549		500.29	10,896.14	11,396.43	6,000.00	4,253.38	10,253.38		90.01
North Dakota:															
Dickinson*†	104,006	98,531	138	6,518	23,445	27,268		1,261.00	1,788.10	3,049.10	2,024.93	1,357.00	3,411.93	362.83	111.90
Oregon:															
Burns†	3,540,721	328,588	241	40,634	47,756	51,666		4,012.11	4,449.13	8,461.24	4,572.64	2,600.00	7,172.64		84.77
La Grande*†	214,020	264,740	467	38,886	78,511	73,016		6,262.61	6,190.53	12,453.14	6,000.00	3,353.00	9,353.00		75.11
South Dakota:															
Bellefourche†	66,035	312,120	304	25,454	76,601	83,580		1,240.86	3,533.93	4,774.79	3,000.00	2,670.70	5,670.70	895.91	118.76
Utah:															
Vernal †	1,477,987	1,540	155	18,039	15,347	18,309	2,523.21	18,214.42	4,442.74	25,180.37	2,982.68	2,246.82	5,229.50		20.77
Washington:															
Vancouver *†	140,831	58,990	70	9,826	3,529	28,154		208.93	825.04	1,033.97	1,024.54	1,805.50	2,830.04	1,796.07	273.71
Walla Walla *†	108,758	83,339	72	1,716	11,140	11,505		2,059.00	718.69	2,777.69	1,169.85	1,457.75	2,627.60		94.60
Waterville *†	262,263	148,003	429	182,576	13,365	29,765	11,266.37	3,407.47	4,086.98	18,760.82	3,000.00	3,011.45	6,011.45		32.04
Yakima *†	197,640	92,160	96	11,789	15,117	51,144		2,613.17	2,367.50	4,980.67	2,627.14	1,817.50	4,444.64		89.24
Wisconsin:															
Wausau *†	4,652	11,148	76	1,469	1,896	3,428		787.77	628.35	1,416.12	1,024.09	1,459.78	2,483.87	1,067.75	175.40
Wyoming:															
Cheyenne *†	3,020,610	1,091,564	1,327	131,146	277,318	288,018		51,116.71	31,271.09	82,387.80	6,000.00	5,915.10	11,915.10		14.46
Newcastle †	438,605	1,171,837	1,316	114,437	309,068	341,311		15,528.75	21,550.36	37,079.11	6,000.00	9,498.34	15,498.34		41.80

Offices which will remain:

Alabama: Montgomery.
 Alaska: Anchorage, Fairbanks (ex officio), and Nome (ex officio).
 Arizona: Phoenix.
 Arkansas: Little Rock.
 California: Los Angeles, Sacramento, San Francisco, and Visalia.
 Colorado: Denver, Glenwood Springs, Montrose, and Pueblo.
 Florida: Gainesville.
 Idaho: Boise and Lewiston.
 Louisiana: Baton Rouge.
 Michigan: Marquette.
 Minnesota: Cass Lake.
 Montana: Havre, Helena, Miles City, and Missoula.
 Nebraska: Lincoln.
 Nevada: Carson City.
 New Mexico: Las Cruces, Roswell, and Santa Fe.
 North Dakota: Bismarck.
 Oklahoma: Guthrie.
 Oregon: Lakeview, Portland, Roseburg, The Dalles, and Vale.
 South Dakota: Pierre and Rapid City.
 Utah: Salt Lake City.
 Washington: Seattle and Spokane.
 Wyoming: Buffalo, Douglas, Evanston, and Lander.
 Total, 45 offices.

Of this work the cooperation of Congress is asked. A large annual saving will result and we have assurance of the officials best qualified to speak that service to the public will not suffer.

SURVEYORS GENERAL

There is another matter in which the General Land Office asks the cooperation of Congress to secure economy. They ask that the office of the surveyors general be abolished and that the work heretofore handled by the surveyors general be

consolidated with the field surveying service. The bill contains this paragraph:

The office of surveyor general is hereby abolished, effective July 1, 1925, and the administration of all activities theretofore in charge of surveyors general, including the necessary personnel, all records, furniture, and other equipment, and all supplies of their respective offices, are hereby transferred to and consolidated with the field surveying service, under the jurisdiction of the United States supervisor of surveys, who shall hereafter administer same in association with the surveying operations in his charge and under such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may provide.

Governor Spry, Commissioner of the General Land Office, thus stated the purpose of this:

Mr. SPRY. To bring the entire field surveying service under one administrative head and secure greater economy in operation the position of United States surveyor general should be abolished and the work of their offices consolidated with the field surveying service under the supervisor of surveys.

This change will result in an immediate and continuing annual saving of \$167,210.

Comparison of appropriations

	1925	1926
Surveying public lands, Interior Department.....	\$700,000	\$840,290
Surveying public lands, field classification.....	92,820	
Surveyors general, Interior Department.....	175,000	
Surveyors general, field classification.....	39,680	
Total appropriations.....	1,007,500	840,290
Total reduction.....		167,210

This question has to do with the important work of surveying the public lands.

Statement showing, in acres, area of public lands surveyed during the fiscal year 1924, also total area surveyed and unsurveyed on June 30, 1924

States	1924	Surveyed to June 30, 1924	Unsurveyed to June 30, 1924
Alabama		32,818,560	
Alaska ¹	66,845	1,770,405	376,395,355
Arizona	924,241	39,687,370	33,151,030
Arkansas	461	33,616,000	
California	381,339	82,389,809	17,227,471
Colorado	145,563	63,990,625	2,350,495
Florida	1,404	35,111,040	
Idaho	535,853	37,920,367	15,426,193
Illinois		35,867,520	
Indiana		23,068,800	
Iowa		35,575,040	
Kansas		32,335,360	
Louisiana		29,061,760	
Michigan	17	36,787,200	
Minnesota	281	51,749,120	
Mississippi		29,671,680	
Missouri		43,985,280	
Montana	427,522	80,311,187	13,237,453
Nebraska		49,157,120	
Nevada	486,492	46,025,064	24,262,376
New Mexico	896,221	64,342,216	14,059,704
North Dakota		44,917,120	
Ohio		26,073,600	
Oklahoma		44,424,960	
Oregon	132,214	54,561,058	6,627,422
South Dakota	22,863	48,943,759	251,761
Utah	904,043	35,742,391	16,855,369
Washington	226,165	35,776,619	6,998,421
Wisconsin	40	35,363,840	
Wyoming	256	58,903,858	3,556,302
Total	5,151,820	1,289,946,728	530,419,352
Resurveyed	1,441,628		

¹ Has office of surveyor general.

Statement of lands surveyed and resurveyed in States which have surveyors general, during the fiscal year 1924

State	Original surveys, 1924		Resurveyed, 1924		Unsurveyed to June 30, 1924	
	Acres	Rank	Acres	Rank	Acres	Rank
Alaska	66,845	11			376,395,355	1
Arizona	924,241	1			33,151,030	2
California	381,339	7	100,948	4	17,227,471	4
Colorado	145,563	9	535,188	1	2,350,495	12
Idaho	535,853	4			15,426,193	6
Montana	427,522	6			13,237,453	8
Nevada	486,492	5	14,897	6	24,262,376	3
New Mexico	896,221	3	4,852	7	14,059,704	7
Oregon	132,214	10			6,627,422	10
Utah	904,043	2	25,530	5	16,855,369	5
Washington	226,165	8	154,682	3	6,998,421	9
Wyoming	256	12	292,741	2	3,556,302	11

As was stated to the committee by Governor Spry, the surveyors general were originally created under authority of section 2207, United States Revised Statutes, as district headquarters, from which the field work of surveying the public lands under the old contract system was administered. The act of Congress approved June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 703-740), brought to a close the practice of having these surveys executed under contracts by authorizing the employment of a permanent corps of United States surveyors and engineers selected under competitive civil-service requirements. The change affected very materially the functions of these offices, and "since that time they have been a more or less unnecessary intermediate agency between the administrative and supervisory unit in the General Land Office and the field surveying organization, and should therefore, in the interest of economy and efficiency, be consolidated with the field surveying service as recommended in these estimates."

In the hearings Mr. Bond, chief clerk of the office, stated the bill carries enough money to handle the work efficiently.

The change involves only the abolition of political jobs and a consolidation of the work. In numerous western cities we have now side by side headquarters of the field surveying service and offices of the surveyors general. There is duplication of expense and lessening of efficiency. The surveyors general are political appointments, in the main filled by men without technical training. A few weeks ago one of them failed to cooperate with the Department of Justice in furnishing needed information from his records because his political friends were affected. The bureau recommends that this work be consolidated, that the political positions be abolished, and that there

be a unified technical service to carry on this important work. It occurs to me that in a bureau that is so rigorously enforcing economy in those branches where they have authority, it is incumbent upon Congress, if we are in earnest in this matter of economy, to cooperate with the General Land Office and bring about this consolidation that is at once in the interest of efficiency and economy.

ARMY AND NAVY PENSIONS

This bill carries \$197,000,000 for payment of Army and Navy pensions. That is \$25,500,000 below the appropriation for that purpose the current year and about \$17,000,000 to \$18,000,000 below the probable actual expenditures. The estimate last year was \$230,000,000 for the current year, which impressed the committee as higher than necessary, and while we wished to be sure of avoiding a deficit we felt safe in recommending a reduction to \$222,500,000, which was accepted by the House. When the bill was under consideration by the House I stated concerning this—

We do not agree with the Pension Office that \$230,000,000 is necessary for 1925. We went into the matter carefully and with more detail than I care to go into with you at this time, and as a result of our investigations we felt perfectly safe in reducing the amount to the extent of \$7,500,000. My personal opinion is, from such study as I can give the matter in my amateur way, that unless the laws should be changed the expenditures will likely not exceed \$215,000,000 in 1925. But we have wanted to be safe, although we have not gone to the extreme degree of safety that the bureau did in their estimates.

I have no desire to imperil any reputation that may gain me as a forecaster on this involved matter, but I feel assured the estimate sent to Congress of \$197,000,000 for 1926 is as low as it is safe for us to go.

In connection with this subject the following information in tabloid form will be of interest:

Pensioners of the different wars on the roll at the close of last fiscal year

	1924	Veterans	Widows
Civil War	399,951	146,815	250,341
War with Spain	101,142	85,038	13,206
War of 1812	33		33
War with Mexico	1,468	31	1,437
Indian wars	6,830	3,893	2,937
Regular Establishment	16,037	12,283	2,226
World War	78	56	14
Total	525,539	248,116	270,194

Pensioners of the Civil War on the roll at the close of the last 15 fiscal years

Year	Soldiers	Widows	Minors, dependents, etc.	Total
1913	462,379	293,129	6,931	762,439
1914	429,354	292,343	6,432	728,129
1915	396,370	289,218	6,018	691,606
1916	362,277	286,080	5,650	654,007
1917	329,226	284,216	4,884	618,326
1918	298,808	288,815	4,170	591,793
1919	271,391	293,244	3,708	568,343
1920	243,520	286,844	3,365	533,729
1921	218,775	278,098	3,229	500,102
1922	193,791	269,245	3,039	466,075
1923	168,542	264,580	3,104	436,226
1924	146,815	250,341	2,795	399,951

Amount paid to pensioners, 1790 to 1924, inclusive

War of the Revolution	\$70,000,000.00
War of 1812	46,145,923.39
Indian wars	25,640,832.23
War with Mexico	56,545,364.31
Civil War	6,427,106,586.49
War with Spain	126,673,359.67
Regular Establishment	67,557,368.44
World War	168,538.79
Unclassified	16,513,425.54
Total	6,836,351,398.86

The number of claims to be filed this year is estimated at 100,000. The largest number ever filed in one year being 138,078 in 1921. In 1924 there were filed claims as follows:

Civil War veterans	21,822
Civil War widows	12,095
Spanish War veterans	56,127
Spanish War widows	4,215
Others	21,566
Total	115,825

The largest number of claims ever pending at one time was 99,100 in 1921. There are now pending 50,000 claims, and the work is practically current.

The largest number of pensioners was in 1902, when 999,402 were on the roll. There were 525,539 on the roll June 30, 1924.

The largest expenditure was \$263,012,500.18 for 1923 as against \$215,000,000 the current year.

The salary roll is 786 employees, the smallest force in over 40 years, 51 less than 1925, 201 less than 1924, and 329 less than 1917.

The oldest pensioner is 105 years old and is the widow of a veteran of the War of 1812. There were at the close of the fiscal year 1924, 33 widows of veterans of that war. The youngest is now 65. She married the veteran in 1883 when she was 23 and he 86, he having been a boy of 16 when in the service. If she lives to the age of 86, his age at their marriage, she will in 1945 be drawing pension as the result of her husband's military service 130 years before. You see something of the possibilities that come where patriotism, national gratitude, and romance are intertwined.

THE PATENT OFFICE

In the bill before you last year in reference to the item for the Patent Office, there was a plan worked out by the committee and the commissioner intending to bring the work of the Patent Office up current at the earliest possible time. Because of the time needed to organize the temporary force it was estimated that two years would be required, the fiscal years 1925 and 1926. That program was adopted and provisions made for it the current year. In order to complete that program and be able to hold the commissioner wholly responsible to his promise, it is necessary to give \$191,000 for the temporary roll for 1926, and we recommend that figure though \$36,000 above the estimate. Thereby he will be able to continue the force now organized for that purpose and be current by July 1, 1926.

These figures will be of interest in that connection:

Applications for patents, including reissues, designs, trade-marks, labels, and prints

Year ended June 30—	
1914	81,539
1915	79,116
1916	80,621
1917	81,538
1918	73,307
1919	75,657
1920	102,940
1921	107,656
1922	113,674
1923	100,809
1924	99,653

A comparative statement of the appropriations for 1925, the Budget estimates for 1926, and the amounts recommended in the accompanying bill for 1926, under principal subjects exclusive of tribal funds

Object	Appropriations for 1925, including amounts in pending deficiency and field classification bills	Budget estimates for 1926	Amount recommended in the bill for 1926	Increase (+) or decrease (-), bill compared with 1925 appropriation	Increase (+) or decrease (-), bill compared with 1926 Budget estimates
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS					
Salaries, commissioner's office	\$388,640.00	\$381,500.00	\$381,500.00	-\$7,140.00	-\$7,140.00
Total, Indian lands	70,340.00	211,767.67	100,000.00	+29,660.00	-\$111,767.67
Total, industrial assistance	637,936.00	582,000.00	590,000.00	-47,936.00	+\$8,000.00
Total, water supply	83,680.00	76,300.00	77,300.00	-6,380.00	+\$1,000.00
Total, irrigation and drainage	1,719,950.00	1,367,900.00	1,084,500.00	-635,300.00	-283,310.00
Total for education	6,332,663.00	6,260,760.00	6,194,500.00	-138,063.00	-66,260.00
Total for conservation of health, etc.	644,590.00	726,000.00	800,000.00	+155,410.00	+\$74,000.00
Total, general support and civilization	1,753,430.00	1,577,050.00	1,485,520.00	-267,910.00	-91,530.00
Total, roads and bridges	112,200.00	18,000.00	18,000.00	-94,200.00	-94,200.00
Total, annuities and per capita payments	31,020.00	31,020.00	31,020.00		
Miscellaneous	1,154,932.80	1,144,730.00	1,120,840.00	-34,092.80	-23,890.00
Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs, exclusive of tribal funds	12,929,281.80	12,377,027.67	11,883,270.00	-1,046,011.80	-493,757.67
Total reimbursable of above	2,162,970.00	1,716,140.00	1,437,770.00	-725,200.00	-278,370.00
FROM TRIBAL FUNDS					
Total, Indian lands	205,000.00	156,860.00	156,860.00	-48,140.00	-48,140.00
Total, irrigation and drainage	138,800.00	17,700.00	17,700.00	-121,100.00	-121,100.00
Total, for education	59,700.00	61,290.00	61,290.00	+1,590.00	+1,590.00
Total, support and civilization	1,858,300.00	1,868,830.00	1,868,830.00	+10,530.00	+10,530.00
Total, roads and bridges	9,000.00	29,000.00	29,000.00	+20,000.00	+20,000.00
Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs, from tribal funds	2,270,800.00	2,133,680.00	2,133,680.00	-137,120.00	-137,120.00

PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES

There are some matters to which I desire to call your attention. First, there was in the estimate this item:

For payment of certain local taxes to the counties of Stevens and Ferry, in the State of Washington, on allotted Colville Indian lands, as provided by the act of June 7, 1924, \$115,767.67.

June 30—

Applications awaiting action

1914	22,283
1915	18,270
1916	16,559
1917	16,058
1918	14,769
1919	17,735
1920	34,355
1921	49,334
1922	67,367
1923	71,927
1924	62,645
Nov. 28, 1924	56,043

This office has an intimate connection with our industrial welfare, is self-sustaining, and the highest state of efficiency is imperative. The commissioner and his staff are making great efforts, as our hearings will fully demonstrate. The total receipts for 1924 were, net, \$3,042,270.22. The expenditures were \$231,065.15 above that figure, but the Patent Office has to its credit a net surplus of \$8,232,249.64 of receipts over expenditures to date.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

I want to discuss also the Bureau of Indian Affairs, a great bureau that has to do with the Government's relations and efforts for the Indian population totaling 346,902, a population that has been increasing of late years. It has the administration of the business affairs of those Indians, and the revenues belonging to the Indians collected by the Indian Service during the last fiscal year exceeded \$32,000,000. The Indians have individual and tribal property, which in 1924 totaled \$1,052,000,000, and in 1923, \$1,010,000,000. In other words, in a year the value of their individual and tribal property increased some \$42,000,000.

The largest part of the revenue for 1924 came from royalties and bonuses on oil leases on Indian lands, proceeds from the sale of timber on Indian reservations, and reimbursement accounts with Indians for livestock, farming implements, and other equipment.

The \$32,861,768 receipts of the Indian Bureau were deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the various Indian tribal funds, but a large part was later drawn out during the year and paid to individual Indians. The greatest distribution was to the Osage Indian Tribe of Oklahoma.

The total expense of the Indian Service from the Treasury, exclusive of tribal funds, for the current year is \$12,929,281, of which \$2,162,970 is reimbursable. In the bill before you there is a total of \$11,883,270 from the Treasury, a decrease of \$1,046,011.80 below the current year and \$493,757.67 below the estimates. The following statement gives a general view of their expenditure:

That was authorized by the following act:

An act to authorize the payment of certain taxes to Stevens and Ferry Counties, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Stevens and Ferry Coun-

ties, in the State of Washington, as taxes claimed by said counties under section 2 of the act of July 1, 1892, relating to the payment of local taxes on allotted Colville Indian lands, the following sums, to wit: To Stevens County, \$44,309.67; to Ferry County, \$71,458: *Provided*, That there may be deducted from said amounts by the Secretary of the Interior such sum or sums as he may find have been paid to said counties for Indian tuition; also the excess, if any, where the rate based on the value of Indian allotments may be found to be in excess of the rate on taxable land.

SEC. 2. That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, \$115,767.67 or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the payment of said sums to said counties, as provided in the foregoing section.

The report on that bill in the House carried this letter from the Secretary of the Interior:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, February 5, 1924.

HON. HOMER P. SNYDER,
Chairman Committee on Indian Affairs,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SNYDER: The receipt is acknowledged of your request dated January 9, 1924, for report on H. R. 1414, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, entitled "A bill to authorize the payment of certain taxes to Stevens and Ferry Counties, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes."

The claims of Stevens and Ferry Counties are based upon section 2 of the act of July 1, 1892 (27 Stat. 62), and no objection will be made to the enactment of H. R. 1414 into law.

The provisions of the bill are identical with H. R. 5418, Sixty-seventh Congress, first session, a favorable report upon which was made to your committee on May 16, 1921, in which reference was made to a report dated December 6, 1920, to the President of the Senate on paragraph 22 of the Indian appropriation act approved February 14, 1920 (41 Stat. 408, 432). These reports contain in full the reasons for favorable action.

Very truly yours,

HUBERT WORK.

The statement of the department that the claims were based on the act of 1892 would naturally disarm opposition to the bill. But investigation in our hearings developed that the act of July 1, 1892, provided:

SEC. 2. * * * set apart in the Treasury of the United States for the time being, but subject to such future appropriation for public use as Congress may make, and that until so otherwise appropriated may be subject to expenditure by the Secretary of the Interior from time to time, in such amounts as he shall deem best, in the building of schoolhouses, the maintenance of schools for such Indians, for the payment of such part of the local taxation as may be properly applied to the lands allotted to such Indians, as he shall think fit, so long as such allotted lands shall be held in trust and exempt from taxation, and in such other ways as he may deem proper for the promotion of education, civilization, and self-support among said Indians.

That is to say, it authorized these payments in lieu of taxes from the tribal funds, if sufficient was available. The act of June 7, 1924, provides for payment from public funds.

In the first place, the act of 1924 provides for \$115,767.67 to be paid, less the amount that has been paid for tuition of Indian children in the public schools in those counties. After inquiry we learned that the tuition amounted to \$26,000 and more, and the payment to the counties would need to be reduced accordingly. Further, the act of 1924 required that it should be ascertained that the rate of taxation that would be applied on these Indian lands was not to be at a higher rate than on other lands.

But there have been no steps taken to bring about the ascertainment of the truth as to that, so that in any event we are not ready to act upon this particular item. In the hearings Mr. Meritt said:

Referring to the inquiry about the report of the official who made the investigation regarding the claims of Stevens and Ferry Counties, in the State of Washington, you are advised that our records show that this report was transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate under date of December 6, 1920, and this report has not been returned to the files of this office. Careful investigation of the records of the Indian Office show that there has been expended for tuition of Indian children in Ferry County, \$18,263.37, and for tuition of Indian children in Stevens County, \$6,033.93. We have no information about "the rate based on the value of Indian allotments may be found to be in excess of the rate on taxable land." Any further information available from the files of this office desired by the committee will be gladly furnished.

But there is more involved in this than that. The act of 1892, as I have said, authorized the payment of these moneys

in lieu of taxes out of the funds of the Indians received from the sale of the ceded portion of the reservation. But the act of 1924, which it was said was to carry into effect the act of 1892, concerns a payment out of the Treasury, and not out of the funds of the Indians.

To make this appropriation of \$115,000, as authorized by the act of 1924, would be a precedent that if carried out logically would involve the Treasury in the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars, because there are probably a thousand counties in the West that are fully as much entitled to such recognition from the Treasury as are those two counties, as far as payment from public funds is concerned. And so the committee have eliminated that item from the bill.

INDIAN EDUCATION

There are said to be, according to the last available figures, Indian children of school age and eligible to the number of 80,906, and there were actually in school in 1924, 65,184; and the present actual attendance is 67,125. There were 4,071 more Indian children in school in 1924 than there were in 1923. There are about 2,000 more in school now than there were a year ago. They have, out of about 81,000, 67,000 in school.

Some of your sensationalists, who live upon their attacks upon the Government administration of Indian affairs, charge that there are so many thousand Indian children out of school, and they seem to feel that we have been terribly recreant in our duty to that race. But I have a statement by the Bureau of Education to the effect that nearly as great a proportion of all the children of the United States are also out of school. The bureau says:

Total children, white and colored, of school age, 28,627,201.

Of the total number of children of school age, there were enrolled in public schools 23,239,227; in private schools, 1,580,873; total, 24,820,100.

But your committee is highly appreciative of the importance of increased and improved facilities for education.

The committee for several years has been increasing the capacity of the Indian schools, and the bureau has been diligent in getting them into school, and it is probable that we have nearly reached the point where we have facilities for all the Indian children that can be put to school. At the same time there is a rapid growth in the appreciation on the part of the Indians of the educational facilities offered them.

TABLE NO. 2.—Indian and school population, number eligible for school attendance, number in schools, etc., and capacity of schools provided for Indian children during fiscal year ended June 30, 1924

States and superintendencies	Indian population	Number of school age	Eligible for attendance	Eligible not in school	Total in school	Total capacity in all schools
Grand total.....	312,702	87,627	80,996	15,512	65,484	173,065
Arizona.....	43,840	12,023	10,685	3,210	7,475	5,928
California.....	18,702	3,830	3,663	418	3,245	3,125
Colorado: Consolidated Ute.....	792	259	226	46	180	212
Iowa: Sac and Fox.....	370	103	82	6	76	70
Kansas: Pottawatomie.....	1,528	540	491	100	391	283
Michigan.....	1,214	740	689	689	573
Minnesota.....	13,920	4,029	3,895	434	3,461	2,881
Mississippi: Choctaw.....	1,200	450	384	194	190	210
Montana.....	12,953	4,133	3,811	937	2,874	2,807
Nebraska.....	2,574	889	650	93	557	349
Nevada.....	1,187	1,460	1,333	236	1,097	902
New Mexico.....	20,834	5,676	4,913	726	4,187	3,366
North Carolina: Cherokee.....	2,581	956	798	24	774	711
North Dakota.....	9,818	3,101	2,855	263	2,592	2,031
Oklahoma.....	117,364	31,868	31,407	7,472	23,935	22,168
Total, western Oklahoma.....	15,858	4,889	4,428	98	4,330	4,073
Five Civilized Tribes.....	101,506	26,979	26,979	7,374	19,605	18,095
Oregon.....	4,492	1,415	1,261	287	974	954
South Dakota.....	23,924	7,120	6,025	530	5,495	4,541
Utah: Uintah and Ouray.....	1,146	325	293	100	193	183
Washington.....	10,789	3,084	2,587	192	2,395	2,264
Wisconsin.....	7,973	2,164	1,929	33	1,896	2,356
Wyoming: Shoshone.....	1,808	531	446	59	387	402
Alaska.....	344	344	344
New York.....	4,272	1,245	1,245	1,245	1,195
Florida.....	467	132	132
Total.....	4,739	1,721	1,721	1,589	1,195

¹ Report of 1923.

That has been increased since and will be further increased when current construction is completed.

The total in the pending bill for education is \$6,194,500 from the Treasury, well over half of the total expenditure of \$11,883,270 for the bureau.

CONSERVATION OF HEALTH

A second great agency in solving the Indian problem is through conservation of health. It is surprising that no specific

appropriation was made for the conservation of the health of the Indians until 1910, when \$12,000 was given. The amount was increased until in 1924 it was \$370,000. For the current year, by reason of the experience of members of the committee who had examined the conditions on the reservations and elsewhere, it was increased to \$500,000, and the bill before you further increases it to \$800,000, including the cost of field classification.

IRRIGATION ECONOMIES

There is a reduction of \$283,310 in the appropriation for irrigation and drainage on Indian reservations; \$178,910 of that reduction results from this one motive. Many of these irrigation projects, large and small, serve both the Indians and the whites who are either adjacent to them or who intermingle with them in their land settlements. The theory is that those white owners or lessees shall pay their share of the cost of operation of the project—a pro rata that should be fairly assessed to their lands. There was an act passed in 1914 which came to the attention of the committee—I had not known of it myself before—that authorized any collections of that kind to be used for the same purpose, and they would then become available until expended and be a species of revolving fund.

There has been nothing said about that and the practice has been to appropriate the full amount deemed necessary to operate and maintain these projects. Then during the year, if they did succeed in making collections from the whites, they had that; they were able to use first the appropriation that was limited to the specific year, and then they had the other funds to fall back upon if they should need it. We really have not known much about it, and this year when we tried to find out about it the information was so diversified in its habitat outside of Washington that the bureau here was not able to give us very complete information. They were kind enough to telegraph to the reservations, but even so the hearings do not give definitely the information we ought to have as to the cost of operation and maintenance, or as to the amount assessed against the white owners and lessees, and to the amount that reasonably ought to be assessed against them. The committee felt that we should know more about these things. We might have recommended the repeal of that provision of 1914 enabling them to use these funds. That is a custom that does not prevail generally as to governmental receipts. But it seemed desirable also to force a more active program of proper assessments of the charges against the whites to the white-owned and white-leased lands, to force a more active program of properly assessing and collecting such charges. So we tried in a rough way to deduct from the estimates required the amount that the white lands ought to contribute. These deductions are as follows:

Yuma	28,710
Fort Hall	25,000
Flathead	35,000
Blackfoot	7,000
Crow	24,000
Confederated Utes	24,000
Wind River	35,000
Total	178,710

As to these several projects the following summarizes the available information:

YUMA

Under works, 8,312 acres.
Indian, 2,800 acres; white owned or leased, 5,220 acres.
Operation and maintenance charges on whites, \$28,710. Estimate reduced that amount.

FORT HALL

Under works, 52,000 acres; cultivated, 30,517 acres.
Indian owned and not leased, 17,858 acres, of which 7,249 acres cultivated; white owned, 14,706 acres, of which 3,822 acres cultivated; white leased, 19,446 acres. Total, 52,010 acres.
Assessment, 1924, against white-owned lands, \$18,382.50; against white-leased lands, \$24,807.50. Total, \$42,690.
Amount collected, 1924, \$21,958.21.
Estimate, \$40,000; recommended, \$15,000.

FLATHEAD

Under constructed works, 105,000 acres, which is all assessed a minimum of 25 cents, \$26,250.
Actually irrigated, 34,500 acres, \$49,250; subject to additional assessment.
Cultivated by Indians, 2,226 acres; cultivated by whites, 32,274 acres.
Operation and maintenance, 1924, was \$35,000; personnel since reduced.
Estimate, \$45,000; recommended, \$10,000.

BLACKFOOT

Under constructed works, 20,900 acres.
Irrigated by 55 Indians, 292 acres; irrigated by whites, 3,549 acres.
Minimum, \$2,661.75; additional assessments, \$5,323.50. Total, \$7,985.25.
Total operation and maintenance, \$12,492.37; minus, \$7,985.25. Total, \$4,507.12.
Estimate, \$12,000; recommended, \$5,000.

CROW

Under constructed works assessed at \$1.50 per acre, 1924, 53,000 acres.
Irrigated, 30,032 acres.
Irrigated by Indians, 8,076 acres.
Irrigated by whites, 21,956 acres.
Total assessment, \$79,500.
Total collections, \$11,039.
Operation and maintenance cost, 1924, \$77,707.75.
Mr. Reed says, page 853, ought to be cut down this year one-third or more. Hope to operate for \$40,000.
Estimate, \$40,000.
Recommend \$16,000.

CONFEDERATED UTES

Under constructed works, 77,195 acres.
Actually irrigated, 53,222 acres.
Irrigated by Indians, 8,646 acres.
Irrigated by whites—owned, 16,506 acres.
Irrigated by whites—leased, 28,070 acres (exempt).
1924, much assessed was extended.
1924, collected \$16,096.42 from white owners. 1924, collected \$1,700.36, canal carriage right capacity. Total, \$17,796.78.
Mr. Reed says, page 864, \$40,000 will cover operation and maintenance for 1926.
Estimate, \$40,000.
Recommend \$16,000.

WIND RIVER

Necessary to combine ceded and diminished, as no information available separately.
Under construction works, 55,000 acres.
Irrigated, 25,447 acres.
Indians cultivated, 7,693 acres.
White owned and leased, 22,299 acres.
Total assessments, at \$1.50 per acre, \$82,500.
Collected, 1924, \$12,052.
Cost of operation and maintenance, 1924, \$85,524.
Whites, four-ninths of \$85,000, \$37,000.
Balance for Indians, \$48,000.
Estimate, \$105,000.
Recommend, \$50,000.

The orders which are in effect from the department in all cases require, apparently, that those charges be paid in advance, so that we are trying to appropriate here enough to cover the Indians' share of the project for operation and maintenance, and it is up to the Indian Office to collect, and it is up to the whites to pay their share of the cost, in order to have the project properly operated. As I say, our information is not exact, so we have tried to err on the side of liberality for this year, trusting that in another year a full presentation will be made which will enable us to make a more complete disposition of the money.

THE COOLIDGE DAM

The bill carries an item of \$450,000 to commence construction of the Gila River Reservoir. This is the only new Indian irrigation project in the bill and is of much importance, planned to cost \$5,500,000 and serve Indian and white owned land and public lands, and was authorized by the act of June 7, 1924, with greater safeguards for success of the project and return of the construction costs to the Treasury with interest than has heretofore been the case.

The dam on the Gila River is to be 200 feet high and impound 760,000 acre-feet of water. The Indian lands served are those of the Pimas, historically peace loving and friends of the whites and followers of agriculture through irrigation for many centuries, and whose water rights have been greatly diminished through encroachments above their lands. Acting upon the suggestion of Representative HAYDEN, in whose district and State the project lies, the committee recommends the dam be hereafter known as the Coolidge Dam.

Pending a thorough examination of the whole subject, further construction in the Montana irrigation projects does not seem wise, and the estimates, restricted to operation and maintenance costs, are accepted with reductions based upon contributions by white owners and lessees as above referred to.

RECLAMATION PROBLEMS

Reclamation, stressed in the President's message you have heard read, is one of the greatest problems for the future of the West and therefore for the future of the country. The placing of men upon land which they themselves own and which they themselves till is the surest foundation for a democracy, and I am a great believer in the program of reclamation for the West. But my contact with it during the past three years and more—during which time I have visited nearly all of the great reclamation projects and during which time I have had charge here of the appropriations for carrying on the work—has impressed me with this fact: That the welfare of the West and the welfare of the country as bound up in the policy of reclamation demands that it is absolutely necessary that this whole program be now put upon a business basis. It must be taken out of politics. Projects must be selected not through political logrolling but upon the basis of merit and with reference to the opportunity there is for each project to succeed and make good. But there never was a time when we were more at sea as to what is going to happen in reclamation than now.

In this work \$150,000,000 has been spent. Some \$18,000,000 or \$20,000,000 has come back. Most of the rest is not yet due. We have provided liberally for accretions to the fund. Out of the amount which has been spent, \$106,990,339 came from the sale of public lands, but that source of revenue is pretty much gone, and during 1926 there is expected to come from that source only \$600,000. For the next fiscal year the principal source of increase for that fund, 1926, will be from oil-leasing royalties, \$7,000,000. The leasing act of 1920 provided that 52½ per cent of the receipts from that source should go to the reclamation fund, 37½ per cent to the States, and 10 per cent to the United States.

When I attempt to intimate that my constituents up in Michigan are interested in the economical and wise expenditure of these funds, the immediate response is that we do not need to worry; that we do not give any of that money; that it comes out of the reclamation fund. In the first place, any big, worth-while program of further extension, such as is demanded, will only be possible through taking more money out of the Federal Treasury, a part of it contributed by my constituents. But, more than that, the principal revenue which goes into that fund next year is \$7,000,000 from oil-leasing royalties. The States in which that oil lies have been pretty well recognized when we turn over immediately to them, without any expenditure on their part for supervision or enforcement of the law, 37½ per cent of all of the value of the oil that comes out of that Government-owned land, and we take 10 per cent for the cost of administration, 52½ per cent going into the reclamation fund. The Nation has an interest in the proper expenditure of the proceeds of our natural resources on the public domain. Where are they to get the money we are to appropriate for reclamation? Well, there is a balance of \$6,000,000 which they expect to have on the 1st of July. They expect to get \$600,000 from the sale of public lands during the year 1926; they expect to get \$7,000,000 from oil-leasing royalties, and \$10,000 from potassium and power royalties. Two million five hundred thousand dollars, when we are spending some \$6,000,000 or \$8,000,000 offhand, for construction. They expect to get back \$2,500,000 in construction repayment on a program which has been under way for 20 years.

Then for operation and maintenance repayments. The figures before us from the service, for the operation and maintenance of these projects for the next fiscal year, are \$3,000,000, and how much do they expect will be repaid to the fund just from operation and maintenance, an annual cost which ought to be taken care of annually? Two million five hundred thousand dollars.

The Bureau of Reclamation is forced to give us figures showing that there will be \$500,000 less repaid to the fund than is paid out of it for operation and maintenance alone. That does not sound very businesslike to me. The estimate in full is as follows:

Estimated funds available, fiscal year 1926	
Probable balance, July 1, 1925	\$6,110,000
Receipts from sale of public lands	\$600,000
Receipts from oil-leasing royalties	7,000,000
Receipts from potassium and power royalties	10,000
Construction repayments	2,500,000
Operation and maintenance repayments	2,000,000
Rentals of irrigation water	350,000
Power returns	350,000
Miscellaneous returns	550,000
	13,360,000
Total	19,470,000

Less:

Repayment on loan from General Treasury	\$1,000,000
Budget, 1926	9,759,000
	\$10,759,000

Probable carry over, July 1, 1926

8,711,000

You recall the deficiency bill which passed this House last session and just yesterday received final action in another legislative body. You recall the circumstances under which that bill passed this House. It carried provisions in it authorizing the commencement of construction upon several new reclamation projects—the Owyhee, the Salt Lake Basin project, the Kittitas division of the Yakima, and a power plant for the North Platte. Most of those projects had never been recommended by the Interior Department or by the Budget, but items were put in the deficiency bill in another body for their construction. It carried also new general legislation. The old reclamation act provided for the repayment of this money, the cost of construction, in 20 years without interest, but the deficiency act which has just gone to the President provides for the repayment of the money not in stated annual portions but with reference to the gross crops produced upon the farms. We have got to keep books on all our farms out there and take a part and tithing of their production each year.

Under this method it is estimated by those best qualified to judge that instead of this money for construction being repaid in 20 years without interest it will run from 35 to 40 years without interest, and as to certain of these new projects the director of the reclamation gave us to understand that probably the time to repay the construction costs as to one project, for instance, that was included in this deficiency bill, would be as much possibly as 138 years, without interest, and the money taken from the Federal Treasury.

I do not care where that money comes from; it is now a trust fund that we ought to handle with special care and with a view to the proper development of the great West.

This House did not believe in those projects being inserted in that way, a haphazard, political, logrolling method, and this House did not believe in the changes in legislation proposed. Some of us thought that the legislation went too far and some of us thought it did not go far enough. I undertake to say there is practically no one in this House that thinks that the legislation with reference to reclamation and so vitally affecting it is wise as it stands in the deficiency bill. But you remember, in the closing moments of the session, a great appropriation bill, that carried emergency appropriations for every branch of the Government, provided for the administration of the bonus, provided for many things vital to good administration, notice was served that that bill could not become law unless this political logrolling was permitted to succeed. In other words, the rule of force, rather than that of reason, was used to select new projects and make new law for this great problem of reclamation, in which we are trying to build for all the centuries to come a contented, land-owning people.

This subcommittee felt that in the present uncertain situation with regard to reclamation and its policies, we ought not to start any new projects, and hence an item included in the estimates with reference to the Spanish Springs project to cost some \$6,000,000 additional expenditure from the Treasury, was eliminated by us, not as condemnation of that project but because we believe the logical thing is to first adopt a policy with reference to repayments and land settlement and so forth, and after that make the appropriations.

There were other items for the Salt Lake, the Kittitas, and the North Platte. Especially as to the Salt Lake and the Kittitas, if we had been allowed to follow our judgment we would have omitted those items also until a new policy could be adopted by the Congress to govern them, but their beginning has been authorized in the deficiency act that just goes to the President. So the items for their further construction we have been obliged to approve, but have attempted to surround them with safeguards that we hope will meet with the approval of the House.

THE SALT LAKE PROJECT

As to these items that are before us, in the interest of conservation of time, I am going to discuss only two. First, the Salt Lake project, where something like \$375,000 was carried in the deficiency bill authorizing the project, and \$1,000,000, is in this bill. We have cut that \$1,000,000 to \$900,000 because of a reappropriation of \$100,000 that they will not be able to use from the other item.

As to the Salt Lake project. The original purpose of reclamation was to develop the public lands of the West; to provide cheap homes to settlers; to take care of reclamation

problems where several States were involved and the interstate rights might come into play; or tremendously large projects like the Boulder Canyon project, where many States are involved and the expenditure is enormous, or where other problems, such as power and its proper conservation for the public use came into play. The Salt Lake project, as I understand it, is this: An area of land, entirely in private ownership and entirely settled and under irrigation, has an insufficient water supply for the whole season. They desire to turn from field crops that mature early to garden truck, and so forth, which would require a longer growing season; but their water supply fails them in early July.

By the construction of a certain reservoir they can be given an additional water supply to carry them through the season. It is an additional facility for an agricultural section. It is an additional facility for many farms now in private ownership and under private cultivation. It is a desirable project, apparently. It is a good business matter, so far as these people are concerned, to have this additional facility; but, you know, up in my country if a farmer wants a silo or some additional facility on his farm he can go to the Farm Loan Board of the United States and can borrow the money for that purpose. The farmer has 40 years in which to repay or amortize the loan, with interest at $4\frac{1}{4}$ per cent, if I am correct. They are the terms on which my constituent would get that aid for an additional facility for his farm, but how is it proposed to give this facility to these farmers of Utah in the deficiency bill that has just gone to the President?

It is proposed to spend some two or three million dollars there and to get the money back in 35 to 40 years; or at the best, under the Warren Act, 20 years, if the work goes under the Warren Act. At any event, the loan is without interest. Now, what reason is there for that? Why for an area in private ownership, should the Treasury of the United States spend its money, on terms more or less vague and uncertain, to provide these private facilities? The only reason they turn to the Federal Government is that they are unable to finance the scheme themselves. All we put in the bill is a provision not unfriendly to the project but friendly to the Treasury and, we think, important to the full success of the policy of reclamation, a provision similar to that that my constituents would have to meet for a loan of this money up there for 40 years, with interest at 4 per cent—an amortization plan. We propose:

Salt Lake Basin project, Utah, first division: For construction of Echo Reservoir and Weber-Provo Canal and incidental operations, \$900,000: *Provided*, That any unexpended balance of any appropriation available for the Salt Lake Basin project for the fiscal year 1925 shall remain available during the fiscal year 1926: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for construction purposes until a contract or contracts, in form approved by the Secretary of the Interior, shall have been made with an irrigation district or with irrigation districts organized under State law, providing for payment by the district or districts as hereinafter provided. The Secretary of the Interior shall by public notice announce the date when water is available under the project, and the amount of the construction costs charged against each district shall be payable in annual installments, the first installment to be 5 per cent of the total charge and be due and payable on the 1st day of December of the year following the date of said public notice, the remainder of the construction charge, with interest on deferred amounts from date of said public notice at 4 per cent per annum, to be amortized by payment on each December 1 thereafter of 5 per cent of said remainder for 40 years, or until the obligation is paid in full: *Provided further*, That the operation and maintenance charges on account of land in this project shall be paid annually in advance not later than March 1, no charge being made for operation and maintenance for the first year after said public notice. It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Interior to give such public notice when water is actually available for such lands.

That policy was adopted last June by the House when it adopted the bill for the San Carlos Reservation in Arizona, where 80,000 acres were involved—40,000 belonging to the Indians and 40,000 to the whites. The House adopted a provision exactly in line with this provision with reference to the Salt Lake as to repayment and amortization, with interest at 4 per cent.

THE KITTITAS

Now, the other project is the Kittitas unit of the Yakima project. I have been on the project, and though I am not thoroughly familiar with it, I have some impressions concerning it and no unfriendly attitude toward it when we get around to a definite, businesslike line of procedure.

We have built a dam that stores the water, and they now ask us to spend some \$6,000,000 additional for canals to carry the water to this additional Kittitas unit. The land there is almost entirely in private ownership, as in the Utah project; but unlike that in the Utah project, it is not developed. There has been a little attempt at irrigation, but not much. In the main it is undeveloped but in private ownership. There again it seems to me that we ought to have a business policy. If we are going to spend \$6,000,000 we ought to have a definite provision for the repayment, and so we have the same provision in reference to repayment that was put in with reference to the San Carlos Reservoir and that we have inserted in the Salt Lake project. As in those we provide for the creation of an irrigation district, so that instead of doing business with the individual water users, as the Government has been asked to do in other projects, we require the land to be formed into an irrigation district. That will have this important result, that the charges collectible annually would be collected as taxes and then turned over to us by the district. So that if it is carried out the people of the Kittitas unit on this Yakima project would have the water brought down through the canal to the land and then turn it over to a local organization that would do the rest.

But there is another important feature. We suggest, further, to protect against exploitation, as the San Carlos bill provided:

That no part of the sum provided for herein shall be expended for construction on account of any lands in private ownership until an appropriate repayment contract in accordance with the terms of this act and in form approved by the Secretary of the Interior shall have been properly executed by a district organized under State law, embracing the lands in public or private ownership irrigable under the project, and the execution thereof shall have been confirmed by decree of a court of competent jurisdiction, which contract, among other things, shall contain an appraisal approved by the Secretary of the Interior, showing the present actual bona fide value of all such irrigable lands fixed without reference to the proposed construction of said Kittitas division, and shall provide that until one-half the construction charges against said lands shall have been fully paid no sale of any such lands shall be valid unless and until the purchase price involved in such sale is approved by the Secretary of the Interior, and shall also provide that upon proof of fraudulent representation as to the true consideration involved in any such sale the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to cancel the water right attaching to the land involved in such fraudulent sale; and all public lands irrigable under the project shall be entered subject to the conditions of this section which shall be applicable thereto: *Provided further*, That no part of the sum hereby appropriated shall be expended for construction until a contract or contracts shall have been executed between the United States and the State of Washington pursuant to its land settlement act embodied in chapter 188, Laws of 1919, as amended by chapter 90, Laws of 1921, and by chapters 34 and 112, Laws of 1923, or additional enactments, if necessary, whereby the State shall assume the duty and responsibility of promoting the development and settlement of the project after completion, including the subdivision of lands held in private ownership by any individual in excess of 160 irrigable acres, the securing, selection, and financing of settlers to enable the purchase of the required livestock, equipment, and supplies, and the improvement of the lands to render them habitable and productive. The State shall provide the funds necessary for this purpose and shall conduct operations in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided further*, That the operation and maintenance charges on account of land in this project shall be paid annually in advance not later than March 1, no charge being made for operation and maintenance for the first year after said public notice. It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Interior to give such public notice when water is actually available for such lands.

We suggest measures to guard against speculative values in the land to protect the settler. When on the project I was assured any measure of this kind would be acceptable. We provide for State and Federal cooperation, and our suggestion is in accordance with the recommendation of a local committee of business men—I do not know whether they are all residents of Ellensburg, but several gentlemen of that section who have prepared a very interesting statement. Speaking of the sources of credit open to respective settlers, they refer to the Federal land act, the livestock association, the local banks and insurance, mortgage companies, and private individuals. Then they say:

The committee is of the opinion that in addition to these, special attention should be called to the statement on page 75 of the report relative to the land settlement law of the State of Washington. It is believed that the provisions of this law furnish a very important source of possible credits to settlers on the Kittitas unit.

The State of Washington has enacted a land settlement law to aid in the development of the State and the proper settlement of its land. It has something of a fund to be used for the purpose of extending credit to those who are developing the unsettled parts of the State. The pending bill proposes that the State of Washington and the United States shall cooperate in this work of reclamation as we cooperate in road building, and so forth.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Michigan that he has occupied one hour.

Mr. CRAMTON. I will yield myself 10 minutes more, in which time I expect to be through. That cooperation will be along these lines: The United States would build the works, bringing the water to the land, and then we would deal with the reclamation district, and the State would supervise the settlement of the land and the financing of the settler.

That, we believe, would insure the success of the project and safeguard the return of our investment at some time.

That is just the beginning of the problem. The land has to be cleared and leveled and gotten ready, and it is not an immediate proposition that prosperity comes. It is hard work, and it is work where a man needs to know his business. Under the present law, as it stands, we choose these settlers by lot. The man who draws the lucky ticket gets the 40 acres of land. Of course, under that system we often get men who can not make a success of the development of the land.

VIEWS OF DIRECTOR OF RECLAMATION

The views that I am suggesting to-day are not radical. I do not think they are unfriendly to a proper reclamation development or to these particular projects. The director of the reclamation fund, Doctor Mead, is one of the greatest authorities in the country on that subject, and holds very similar views. He has had great experience.

Doctor Mead was formerly professor of rural institutions in the University of California and was recently chairman of the State land settlement board in that State and a member of the fact finding commission, etc.

Doctor Mead served as consulting engineer in Australia in the planning of irrigation and development and study of land settlement in connection with a commission appointed by the British Government.

He has had a life-long experience in irrigation administration, beginning as assistant State engineer of Colorado, then State engineer of Wyoming, then chief of irrigation and drainage investigations of the United States Department of Agriculture, chairman of the State Rivers and Waters Supply Commission of Australia, consulting engineer of the Interior Department and of a number of countries in which irrigation is an important problem.

Doctor Mead is a graduate in engineering and agriculture of Purdue University and of Iowa State College, a member of the American Society of Civil Engineers and other engineering bodies, and an honorary member of the American Society of Agricultural Engineers.

He made a statement in our hearings which will be found on page 991, and which I shall incorporate as a part of my remarks. We had asked Doctor Mead about the need of reclamation, whether the legislation in the deficiency appropriation bill which had just gone to the President was sufficient and whether under it he could go ahead safely in the development of these projects. The bill before us carried the words "if found feasible." He said that those words had reference not to the engineering possibilities, but to the enactment of further legislation. He told us that the legislation as sent to the President was incomplete. Doctor Mead says:

NEED FOR GENERAL REVISION OF THE RECLAMATION ACT

Mr. MEAD. I would like to express the belief that the future success of reclamation will be promoted by a complete revision of the reclamation act. Many things indispensable to the adjustment of project costs and to the prompt and successful colonization of the land are not included in the bill now before Congress. Among the matters which should have consideration are the following:

(a) The Bureau of Reclamation should have its duties and responsibilities more clearly defined. At present the bureau is a creation of the Secretary to enable him to carry out the duties imposed by Congress. The extent of the commissioner's authority and the policies which control the bureau change with the views of different Secretaries. Such an arrangement is not favorable to continuity of action or the carrying out of a long-time program of development. Giving the bureau definite authority and responsibility would relieve the Secretary of a burden that is destined to become far more arduous in the future.

(b) The time has come for considering requiring interest payments on the construction costs of all new projects. If this were done, it

would put reclamation on a business basis. It would end the favoritism that is now shown the owners of private land in the development of their properties with interest-free money. It would tend to stop the inflation of prices of unimproved land, which has been a continuing abuse in the past and has often prevented realizing the desirable social and economic purposes of the act. If interest is paid, it does not greatly matter when payment begins on the money spent on the works. They could remain the property of the Government until irrigators were ready to assume control, and if the interest rate were made low, say 3 or 4 per cent, no additional burden would be imposed on the settler of small means. On the contrary, it might improve his condition, as he now sometimes pays twice for his water right, once to the Government and again in high land prices and high interest rates on borrowed money.

(c) The increased cost of works and the large amount of money which has to be spent in changing unimproved land into habitable farms make the methods of colonization and farm development matters of first importance. Provision should be made for soil surveys, appraisal of prices of farms according to productive value, whether the land is the property of the Government or excess holdings of private owners. The qualifications of settlers should be scrutinized. There must be publicity to call attention to the opportunities of these projects and a farm development program to aid the beginner in his development. These things are necessary to bring under cultivation abandoned farms on old projects, check the unhealthy increase in tenancy, and insure the prompt settlement, development, and payment of charges on all new projects.

(d) This law ought to be an opportunity for home ownership for the settler of small means. If it is to be this, a fund must be provided from which advances can be made to help in the improvement and equipment of farms of selected settlers who lack all the capital required. We now appropriate immense sums of money to be repaid without interest, for the construction of works which improve the landed possessions of private owners, but we do nothing to help the farmer of small means become the owner of that land. Our terms of payment for works are the most generous of any country. Our aid to the settler and for farm development is the least. The time has come for a reversal of the objects of the Government's liberality.

(e) It is believed that the law should require State approval and State cooperation in the case of all new projects. This is now required in the building of highways and in agricultural extension. Doing this will bring to this complex task a knowledge of local conditions possessed by the State, will arouse the effort and interest of the people most concerned in the success of these new communities, and will lessen the burden on the Federal fund. Now the law not only does not require State effort but gives no opportunity for its exercise.

In his report which has just come to the Congress he emphasizes the seriousness of the situation when he says:

CHANGING CONCEPTION OF RECLAMATION

Discussions in Congress, official reports, and articles in the press all bear testimony to the fact that a change is taking place in our conception of what is needed to make national reclamation by irrigation a social and economic success. All are agreed that a lofty purpose animated the framers of the national reclamation act; yet all familiar with its history realize that not all the conditions under which it would operate were foreseen, and that the results are unlike those anticipated.

When this act was framed the country was still in the pioneer period of development; irrigation works as a rule were neither large nor costly, areas watered from a single project were not extensive, and settlement of these areas shaped itself without organization or plan except in particular cases like those controlled by the Mormon Church. It was the common belief that all that was needed to obtain irrigated farms and prosperous homes was to provide water by building canals and reservoirs. The sponsors of Federal reclamation believed it would be a simple matter to change arid, unimproved land into farms because they thought the settler would have virtually free land, and that water would be cheap because the irrigation works would be constructed by the Government without profit, and with interest-free money.

As a result of this conception, the act dealt almost entirely with the construction and operation of irrigation works. The obstacles settlers would encounter in subdividing the land, equipping farms, and meeting payments on water rights were not regarded as serious enough to require a place in the development program. Time has shown that this was a mistake. Land has not been free; a majority of the settlers had to buy their farms from private owners, in some cases at extortionate prices.

It is now known that the cost of changing 40 or 80 acres of raw land into a farm is not only much greater than was anticipated, but often equals or exceeds the cost of canals and reservoirs. It is beginning to be realized that development under important works requires a study of agricultural and economic problems and the work-

ing out of settlement and development plans if the land is to be brought under cultivation without disastrous delays and waste of money and effort.

In the 22 years of the act's operation, social and economic conditions in the arid region have undergone a revolutionary change. People are no longer willing to undergo the hardships or privations that once were a part of pioneer life or adopt the methods which enabled pioneers to succeed when land was free, when they had no debts for land and very small payments for water rights. Even if they were willing, these methods will not answer to-day when the farmer has to pay higher taxes, pay the higher irrigation charges, pay more for improving farms, and too often pay high interest rates on money borrowed to buy or equip his farm. The financial problems of land settlement have assumed an importance which did not exist 20 years ago and which as yet is only partly realized.

FACT FINDING

The committee organized and began its investigations on October 15, 1923. Its report was submitted on April 10, 1924, and was thereafter approved by the Secretary and the President, and transmitted to Congress.

Unfortunately it did not reach Congress until near the end of the session. Time was lacking to give adequate consideration to all the committee's recommendations. A bill (H. R. 9559, sec. 5) having for its main purpose the financial relief of settlers on existing projects has passed the House and is now before the Senate. This bill is based on the committee's recommendations, but does not include some that are of fundamental importance to future development. If enacted in its present form, it will authorize the following modifications in reclamation methods:

1. The annual payments on construction charges will be based on the average annual gross crop return; now they are based on a percentage of the project cost, fixed without relation to the productivity of the land.
2. Where lack of soil fertility, scarcity of water, or other adequate cause renders settlers unable to pay project costs the Secretary may make such investigation as will disclose the pertinent facts and report them to Congress with recommendations looking to a correction of the fault. The present law calls for repayment of project costs in full regardless of the value of the water made available for irrigation.
3. Operation and maintenance charges will be paid in advance, thus bringing Government practice in harmony with that of privately owned works. Such charges are now for the most part paid after the service is rendered.
4. The costs of the Washington office, including expenses of general investigations similar to the one undertaken by the committee, will be charged to the reclamation fund, but not to the water users, as at present.

SUCCESS OF FUTURE PROJECTS DEPENDENT ON FURTHER LEGISLATION

All the foregoing changes will be helpful in the operation of existing projects; but if legislation stops with these, the amended reclamation act will not provide a working plan for the development of new projects. The reason for this is the fact that many of the best opportunities for future reclamation are where the land is now privately owned. Under the grazing homestead act filings have been made on virtually all the land which can be irrigated, and much of this land is held in areas larger than homestead units and by people who have no intention of becoming irrigators if works are built.

It was never the purpose of the reclamation act to subsidize private owners by furnishing interest-free money to develop their properties, leaving them free to capitalize the Government's investment in reclamation works and add it to the price at which they sell their excess holdings to actual settlers. Nor was it the intention to improve arid estates by supplying water and then leave the owners of those estates to create a system of tenantry and rent the land on an irrigation basis.

Yet the law in its present form is conducive to both of these things and both have happened repeatedly. Lack of adequate authority has prevented the Bureau of Reclamation from adopting a coordinated or orderly subdivision and settlement of these privately owned properties. In too many cases high prices asked for land, held in large tracts before the Government works were authorized, have retarded settlement and agricultural development, have increased tenantry, and made the act an instrument for creating poverty among oversanguine and inexperienced farm buyers.

LEGISLATION RECOMMENDED BY THE ADVISERS

The evidence of the benefits of a coordinated plan of settlement was so convincing that the committee of special advisers sought to provide this. It proposed what seemed to it the only effective means, which was that the Government buy or secure absolute control of all the privately owned land held by any individual in excess of a homestead unit before works are authorized or development begun.

Recommendation No. 12 deals with this subject, was embodied in section 3 of a draft of a bill that accompanied the committee's report, and reads as follows:

"12. DISPOSITION OF PRIVATE LANDS IN EXCESS OF FARM UNIT

"That no reclamation project should hereafter be authorized until all privately owned land in excess of a single homestead unit for each owner shall have been acquired by the United States or by contract placed under control of the Bureau of Reclamation for subdivision and sale to settlers at a price approved by the Secretary. This price to be considered in determining what land and water will cost settlers and hence the feasibility of the project under the payment conditions of the law."

This was opposed by some who do not realize the difficulties in obtaining settlers under existing projects, public or private, and by others who regard land speculation as a legitimate feature of reclamation. Still others believed that the purchase of the land would involve too large an investment of money in a single project and would increase the complications of reclamation. For these reasons this section of the bill was omitted from the measure now before Congress.

If, however, control of settlement were made possible the bureau could go ahead with development, certain that the future settler could get his farm at its actual value. It could proceed to subdivide excess lands into farms of proper size, could adjust the prices of land to agree with productive values, and could give long-time payments with low interest. If the Government owns or controls the land in excess of homestead units, it can properly give liberal terms to farm buyers and make it possible to obtain settlers with small capital but equipped by character and experience to succeed. In other words, if plans for settlement and farm development are made a part of reclamation, the policy will be complete instead of stopping as it now does where engineering ends and agriculture and human welfare begin.

The advisory board framed other recommendations to accord with this control of excess land. One of the sections of the act provides that under new works construction charges would not be imposed until a period varying from one to five years after water was ready for irrigators. This is a desirable feature for harassed settlers trying to improve and equip farms, but it will open the way to abuses if it is to apply to excess holdings owned by individuals.

Taking part of the advisory board's legislation recommendations and rejecting part creates an unworkable plan. It is useless to apportion construction costs carefully if the owner of large project areas ignores these in fixing selling prices of lands to settlers. To let the owner of large holdings escape any payment of project costs for one year or five years, as is provided in subsection E of the bill now before Congress, will delay development and jeopardize some of the most beneficial possibilities of the act.

FUTURE DEVELOPMENT MUST BE SAFEGUARDED AGAINST LAND SPECULATION

The evidence placed before the advisory board was conclusive as to the need for safeguarding future development against the evils of land exploitation.

Unless the law is changed there is no reason to anticipate better results in the future. On new projects some landowners will look to reap their advantages from sales of land to settlers at inflated prices rather than from an increase in earning capacity.

If irrigators have to buy their farms from these owners, what will they be asked to pay for land? On one area where competent opinion fixed the value of land at \$5 an acre, one owner said his price was \$50 an acre. He believes that he can get \$45 an acre rake-off as his part of the benefit of Government construction. He sees nothing wrong in this. Nevertheless the wrong and the injury exist. Money that ought to be spent on improvements would go to make inflated land payments. The field officers of the Bureau of Reclamation would face the heartbreaking experience of seeing settlers work under conditions so discouraging as to give almost no hope of success.

MONEY MUST BE PROVIDED TO SUPPLEMENT SETTLER'S CAPITAL

Nowhere is early and successful closer settlement more important than under Government projects. On all new projects under consideration the existing population must be largely increased if the best results are to be obtained from the cultivation of the land, but it is becoming increasingly difficult to secure settlers equipped with means to develop homes on these new projects. A number of States realizing this have either enacted laws providing financial assistance to group settlement or are considering doing so.

NECESSITY FOR SAFEGUARDS

So the action of this committee and the restrictions we place about these particular items have been forced upon us by the necessities of the case. They are in harmony with the findings of the fact finding commission and the views of the Director of Reclamation. Legislation of a general character may come or may not. We have preferred to let all of these new projects await the enactment of a general, well rounded, well considered, businesslike plan, but our hands are forced. These new projects have been approved in the deficiency bill and it is now proposed to continue them. We are simply in this bill throwing a safeguard about the funds that we are asked to appropriate. I hope that the House will give very careful consideration to these matters. I hope especially that our action will

meet with the full approval of those gentlemen from the West who understand these problems so well, and who are so deeply concerned about their future.

The safeguards that we put in last year with reference to the Minidoka resulted in \$1,984,000 being placed in the Treasury, money that in the main would perhaps have come sometime much deferred, but included were from \$60,000 to \$100,000 of interest charges that never would have been collected except for those safeguards.

THE WILLISTON PROJECT

We propose in this bill certain legislation with reference to the Williston project, where about 1,000 acres receives water and the appropriation requested was \$105,000. But the main business carried on there is not irrigation but the operation of a lighting plant for the town of Williston, and in order to run our pumping plant to furnish electricity to the town of Williston we have got a Government coal mine in operation where we get our fuel. Each year we operate it, but we do not get back enough to pay the cost of operation and maintenance, to say nothing about construction costs. They are saying that if we will appropriate between \$15,000 and \$20,000 for more machinery they can pump the water a little more cheaply. We thought it all right for somebody else to try that, so we have left out any appropriation here for further operation or maintenance of the Williston project, and we propose to give the director of reclamation authority to lease or sell that plant on the best terms possible, an action on our part entirely in accord with his recommendation.

I greatly regret there is not time for me to discuss the problems and work of the Bureau of Mines, the Geological Survey, the National Park Service, and others, but I can not take more time now and I thank you for your patience. [Applause.]

PERMANENT AND INDEFINITE APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. The report makes a distinction between annual appropriations and permanent and indefinite appropriations, amounting to about \$28,000,000. Will the gentleman inform us generally what are the permanent and indefinite appropriations?

Mr. CRAMTON. The annual appropriations are those that are not effective unless we make them each year, and they are good for only one year. The permanent and indefinite appropriations go on until Congress stops them, and the report on page 34 contains a list of those. For instance, there is a fund for schools in Alaska, then there is indemnity for swamp lands to States, and then, for instance, the land-grant colleges get their money through an indefinite and permanent appropriation. These permanent and indefinite appropriations result from various acts of Congress in the past.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Does that mean that the appropriation is made to be drawn upon indefinitely until consumed or that it is an appropriation continued year after year?

Mr. CRAMTON. It is an appropriation that may involve money that is indefinite in extent, that will come into the Treasury during the year, and then the same act provides for its expenditure, perhaps, without any action of Congress. It may require action by a bureau or a department, but without action of Congress that money is paid out during each year in accordance with the original act. [Applause.]

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON].

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered. There was no objection.

CONSCRIPTION OF PROPERTY AND LABOR FOR WAR

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, the proposal to conscript property and labor for war is, upon the surface, highly attractive, but fundamentally it is vicious and illogical.

The proposal has for its avowed purposes to take the profits out of war and to strengthen the national defense. In reality it will do neither. On the other hand, it is open to the most serious objections. Its advocates appear to have dealt with the proposal in a purely objective, near-at-hand sort of way and not to have tried to think it out to the ultimate result or to visualize the consequences that it may ultimately produce.

CONSCRIPTION OF PROPERTY, NOT A NEW IDEA

As an abstract proposition all will agree that there should be no profits made out of war. All will agree to the justice of the position that if men are to be conscripted for war, property

should also be taken. These ideas are not new. On July 9, 1917, in a speech which appears in part 8, volume 55, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 479, I said:

It seems fundamental to me that there should be no profits in war; that neither financiers nor war contractors should be allowed to make money out of their country's misfortune and from human misery and suffering.

Men are being conscripted for the war. Why should not profits and incomes also be conscripted? What moral right is there in big business concerns to pile up swollen fortunes while the country is being bankrupted and bled white? This war should be paid for by those who are able to pay, by those who make a profit from it. They should not be permitted to come out richer than they went in, while the plain people come out decimated and impoverished.

I reiterated on numerous occasions that "no man should be allowed to come out of the war richer than he entered it."

But not always may abstract principles be made rules of action. My views remain the same as during the war. I realized then that it was impracticable to attempt to conscript property; that the final results of such an attempt would prove disastrous; that it were better to permit profit making than to try to stop it by such a means; that it would "be insane to burn the house merely to destroy the vermin."

WHAT THE PROPOSAL IS

The proposal for the conscription of property and labor is presented by several pending measures. Typical of them is H. R. 4841, a bill drafted by a committee of which the commandant of the Army War College, General Ely, was a member and probably the controlling influence. We may therefore accept this bill as showing the attitude of the military mind.

H. R. 4841 authorizes the President, when he considers war to be imminent, to conscript "material resources, industrial organizations, and services" at his discretion, and to fix prices for "services and commodities," both for public and private use.

The bill authorizes the conscription of men of all ages for labor in public and private works. It authorizes the conscription of men to labor for private persons and in privately owned plants from which the owners make profits.

Much was said at the hearings concerning the conscription of all property and of the entire population. But the bill does not so provide. It leaves all persons not required for service as laborers or soldiers free. It authorizes the fixing of prices upon essential services and commodities. It leaves producers and dealers in nonessentials to profiteer at will.

CONSCRIPTION OF PROPERTY AND LABOR

Not attempting to point out the many technical and minor faults of the bill, I prefer to discuss upon principle the proposal which it presents, to wit, the conscription of property and labor for war.

The reasons for my opposition to the conscription of soldiers have often been stated in the House. My position remains unchanged. I will not reiterate my views on conscription of soldiers, but will discuss the aspect of the proposal which contemplates the conscription of property.

However, I refer briefly to the proposal to conscript men for labor in public works and in private enterprises. The constitutional authority to conscript soldiers is found in the power granted Congress to raise armies. There is no provision which can be stretched into an authorization to conscript men for the performance of labor not connected with the production of war materials. The conscription of labor is therefore violative both of fundamental principles and of the clauses of the Constitution which protect civil liberties.

The conscription of labor, where the entire population is not drafted, is a violation of the principle of equality which the proposal professes to protect. Even if the entire population is taken, there is a resulting inequality unless all are placed at the same kind of work. Labor of all kinds is not merely labor, for some callings are more hazardous and some are less pleasant than others. To conscript a man to do hard, dirty, and monotonous drudgery is quite different from conscription for some light and interesting employment. To conscript a man to perform the duties of a calling which he has heretofore followed makes the rule of social maladjustment and inequality into an edict of law. Men follow the occupations which will bring them bread and do the work which they are able to find, and not all work is of equal desirability, nor are all tasks performed by those best fitted for them.

As to conscription of labor for private enterprises or for private advantage it is scarcely necessary to point out that this is merely a form of slavery. It is a slavery in which the master is not required to own the slave and has not the incentive of

selfish interest in his welfare and not even to recognize a tradition of a master's duty and honor. And such a system it is proposed to establish by starting with the workers of America.

A COMMUNISTIC ATTACK ON PRIVATE PROPERTY

The proposal to conscript property for war is a direct attack upon the institution of private property such as would be worthy of extreme communism. It is an attack from above and not from below. Constantly we are warned by the champions of property rights that there is danger that the propertyless multitude may strike at private ownership as an institution. Here we have an attack on property by the Government itself.

A precedent is established of subverting the owner's interest because of an emergency due to war. But war is merely one of many conceivable causes of national emergencies. Flood, famine, and plague may produce emergencies as great as war. If private ownership may be set aside for a war emergency, it may with propriety be set aside on account of other emergencies. And at last the principle being established it is left for those in position of decision to say what is an "emergency." The propertyless masses may conceive of an economic emergency arising from the collection of natural resources and wealth into the control of a few. The proletariat may find in the conscription of property for a war emergency a precedent for confiscation to remedy economic conditions. The attack on property, started from above by those who control the machinery of government, may yet be offered as an excuse for an attack on property from those dissatisfied with the distribution of wealth.

CONFERS POWER NO DESPOT HAS EVER DARED TO EXERCISE

The proposal authorizes the President to conscript property and men at discretion upon a finding that war is imminent. It confers upon the Executive power exceeding that ever given to a constitutional monarch and such as even a despot has never in the world's history dared to exercise.

Under the Constitution the President is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. By virtue of this authority already he may wage actual war, although Congress has refused to declare war. He may send our Navy to bombard seaports and our Army to invade nations with which we are at peace. The President having power to involve us in actual warfare, there is no check upon his authority other than the power of Congress to withhold the soldiers and supplies required to conduct a war.

With the power to conscript property an ambition-mad President might wage war against the overwhelming will of Congress and the people. With the country turned into an armed camp he might rule indefinitely as a military dictator. No Old World "war lord" ever had such power as it is proposed that democratic America shall concede to its President.

SUSPENDS THE GUARANTIES OF THE CONSTITUTION

It is fundamental in the American system that the Constitution remains in operation alike during peace and war and that its safeguards are never suspended. The authorization to conscript property and men upsets for the period of its exercises all constitutional safeguards. It suspends the functions of Congress and courts and throws the people upon the mercy of military authorities, of which the President is the supreme head, and who must regard his will as law. It establishes an absolute military autocracy to continue during the will of the dictator. With the Nation converted into a military camp and under a military régime there can no longer remain trial by jury, exemption from search and seizure, or any of the forms of civil liberty now guaranteed by the Constitution—all will be suspended, possibly lost beyond recall. The control which the President is authorized to exercise over men and property goes to this logical extent.

VIOLATES FIFTH AMENDMENT

It makes no difference whether the conscription of property takes the form of price fixing or of physical seizure and use, it is a taking of property. The war powers which, by construction, Congress is given, of course, can not override the express provisions of the Constitution, which secure to the citizen actual possession of his property and the freedom to contract with regard to it.

It is very clear that the conscription of property for war or other emergency is a taking of property within the prohibition of the fifth amendment to the Constitution. It is clearly a violation of the fifth amendment and probably of other constitutional provisions.

Always I fear the entering wedge. If conscription of men for soldiers and workers is a proper exercise of the functions

of government, there is warrant for governmental concern to see that men are fit for the taking, and the Government may logically interfere in every detail of men's daily lives, to correct their habits, conduct, and practices to the end that they may be more efficient when conscripted.

If conscription of property is proper, then the Government is warranted in seeing to it that the most desirable property is available for the taking. And again there is no bounds beyond which officialdom may not go in meddling with the affairs of the citizen.

COLLECTIVISM AGAINST INDIVIDUALISM

The opposing schools of political thought are the individualists and the collectivists. The former hold that by the exercise of individual responsibility may the evolution and development of the race be best promoted. The collectivists regard society as a mass, a whole, and look for development through raising the general level, including the lowest and weakest elements.

The individualist holds that man has a natural moral right to govern himself, to order his own actions, to live his own life, and that no restrictions should be placed upon the individual except for the protection of the rights of other men. The collectivist is not interested in the individual and feels that he has no natural or moral rights inconsistent with the welfare of the mass.

It is undoubtedly true that our civilization is developing toward collectivism, and that the rights of the individual are held in diminishing regard. Conscription of men and property can be excused only upon the principles of collectivism. Unless we are prepared to accept in its entirety the philosophy of collectivism, we should oppose conscription in all its forms, or, if accepting anything of conscription at all, carry it no further than the occasion absolutely requires.

To conscript unnecessarily or merely to gratify a taste for abstractions is to strike at individualism. Conscription in any form is a step toward collectivism. This is illustrated by the proposal to conscript property, which follows logically upon the conscription of men. No one would have dared to make such a proposal had we not conscripted soldiers. That affords the excuse and the precedent for the conscription of property.

Those who object to Government ownership of railroads and other utilities should recognize that the proposal under discussion goes infinitely further toward collectivism.

CONSCRIPTION OF PROPERTY IMPRACTICABLE

The proposal is unworkable and impracticable. Conscription of property must take the form of physical seizure or of fixing prices. The major part of property is not useful for war purposes. If all is seized, the expense and the vast machinery required for administration will far outweigh any possible benefit. If only the useful property is seized, there will yet be waste, disorder, and difficult machinery to manipulate, with inevitable discrimination, favoritism, corruption, tyranny, and every conceivable governmental abuse.

To whatever extent property may be seized, there will result a corresponding social and economic disruption, with consequences of far-reaching extent and lasting long after the war has ended.

If there is conscription by the fixing of prices, the benefit, in any event, will probably not equal the harm which will be done. Prices are to be fixed for the period of the war only, with no account of the previous prices or prices after the close of the war. Again, there will be overwhelming disruption and confusion, which only the greatest war disaster would cause. The most serious economic aspect of war is the disrupting of the ordered channels of business activity. Governmental price fixing will greatly aggravate the economic disorder which follows a war and make worse that which must necessarily be bad.

The proposal is that "in case of war" the President shall be authorized to conscript. The authority is not contingent upon the strength of our adversary, but may be exercised upon war with some puny and ineffective power. He may exercise it in a war with the least of the nations if in his opinion it is desirable. We may therefore find a war deliberately provoked merely to bring this great power of the President into play, and find it exercised for reasons and under conditions never contemplated by Congress.

There are many who advocate peace-time price fixing for monopolized products or to prevent undue profits. The answer of their opponents is that freedom of contract is inherent in our system and fundamental. If, however, prices may be fixed because of a war emergency, they may with propriety be fixed because of any emergency or for other good cause.

In conscription by price fixing, a precedent will be found for price fixing at any and all times—and away with the freedom of contract.

WILL NOT TAKE PROFIT OUT OF WAR

To conscript property either by seizure or fixing prices will not take the profit out of war. It begins with the beginning of war or when it is imminent. Profits which have been made in anticipation are left intact. During the year and a half prior to our entry into the World War greater profits were made than during the period of the war. The year and a half following the signing of the armistice was a continuous orgy of profiteering and profit making.

Perhaps, after all, the profit makers most dangerous to peace are those who make a business of furnishing Army and Navy supplies between wars—the preparedness-for-private-profit element. Vast profits are made in times of peace by Army and Navy contractors. It is to their interest that there should be great armaments on land and sea, and they foster war scares and other movements for the increase of Army and Navy. Their activities tend far more to produce conditions which make for war than the alleged influence of those who expect to make money while the war is on. The bill does not attempt to reach the peace-time military contractors nor to take away their profits.

The advocates of the proposal agree that where property is seized or prices fixed the owners shall be allowed a reasonable return for its use or profit in its sale. Again, the opportunity for favoritism and corruption in the exercise of discretion in fixing the profit and return.

No class ever derives benefits from war comparable to the professional soldier—the officer who has chosen arms as a profession. With war comes his opportunity for distinction and for rapid promotion. In war the officer caste receives the highest social honors and respect with an accretion of dignity to its calling. The officer is honored and glorified, with a corresponding enhancement of influence and emoluments. Trained to arms, he naturally relies upon force and regards war as a reasonable and proper means for the settlement of disputes between nations. No scheme for deprofiteering war should omit regard for this influential class of war beneficiaries.

DEPRIVES PEOPLE OF POWER TO VETO WAR

The Government of the United States belongs to our citizens. It is the instrumentality by which they express themselves and work their will. The people have the right to govern this country, even to misgovern it if they choose. The people are the source of all authority and have the right to decide public questions. It is a natural and moral right belonging to our system. The people have the right to decide whether there shall be peace or war. To wage war against the deliberate will and judgment of the majority is an indefensible governmental usurpation. There should be no declaration of war not supported by the considered judgment of a substantial majority of the people.

It is practically impossible to have a worth-while referendum upon war. The institution of war under our system must be left to the legislative and executive branches. But there should always be left to the people an opportunity to express their will upon it. They should always have the power to veto the war by refusing to support it. One reason why I have always opposed conscription of soldiers is that it deprives the people of their opportunity for decision upon war by forcing them to serve whether they agree with the justice of the cause. I oppose conscription of property upon the same grounds. It is not only bad public policy and violative of democratic principles, but it violates the natural and moral right of the citizen to take his property for the support of a war waged against his will and for purposes which his conscience does not approve.

PACIFISTS—EX-SOLDIERS—MILITARISTS

Strange to say, the proposal to conscript property and labor has assembled as its advocates antagonistic groups such as pacifists, ex-soldiers, and militaristic advocates of preparedness. Each group supports the measure for separate reasons of its own, reasons which are faulty and illogical except as to the militarists, whose position is in part well taken for their purposes.

The pacifist theory is that it will discourage movements for war. This theory assumes that expectant profiteers deliberately cause wars so that they may derive profits therefrom. Such influences are the least of all factors in producing war. The prospect for profits is too remote and dependent upon too many contingencies, and the hazard of loss too great to move any substantial number, no matter how selfish and wicked

they might be. The profit makers are usually already men of property. Not all such men make war profits. Frequently they sustain heavy losses because of war. Profit making from war depends largely upon chance, the securing of contracts, the particular business in which men are engaged, and other factors which no one can foresee.

I fully agree that in the main wars are about property interests and their consequences are measured in terms of property, but the activities of profit makers most dangerous to the Nation's peace occur prior to war and only finally culminate in war. For illustration, financiers and industrialists advocate larger military forces so as to increase the Government's influence in imperialistic practices—in finding markets and opportunity for investment, and other means of exploitation of foreign fields. It is with no deliberate purpose to cause war that the financier demands of his government that he be given a share in a foreign loan, or that the Philippines be retained so that he may invest and trade. The war comes may be a generation later as the final and unforeseen result of governmental activity taken at his behest, and possibly by the war his investment and accumulations are lost. He did not will the war. Probably he will be dead when it comes.

All efforts to prevent or avoid wars which do not take account of the causes of war are wasted and vain. Wars can not be prevented by paper agreements. They are preventable only by dealing with their causes. Foolish indeed is the pacifist who hopes to avoid war by preparation for war, by organizing his country for war, by increasing its military strength and preparing to wage the most effective war. Such measures do but promote the war spirit and develop the "will for war" and the reliance upon force instead of upon right.

The ex-soldier, rankled by his own conscription, demands that property be put upon an equality with men. But let him reflect that among the conscripts themselves some were exalted and others thrust into the mire—there was no equality, for hundreds of thousands found the easier places and the easier way. Millions of others, for no sufficient reasons, were excused and exempted, and millions more were over or under age, and other millions were not conscripted because they were women. Under no possible system of conscription of soldiers can there be an equality of sacrifice.

Nor would the conscription of property produce equality of sacrifice, for never can the jeopardy of property equal the jeopardy of life, nor can the loss of property bring a pang equal to that of the soldier in the field. Equality of sacrifice, like equality of opportunity, is an abstraction and must remain a dream. In seeking it we must not enter upon impracticable and unsound schemes which will lead us far astray.

FAULTY LOGIC OF THE MILITARISTS

Of the groups supporting the measure only the militarists are sustained by a measure of logic. With conscription of men and property at the discretion of the military Commander in Chief, our Nation will be organized for war as never in all history was any nation before us. It will intimidate the nations, and will give us temporarily a preponderating strength. With 110,000,000 of population potentially under arms, backed by vast natural and industrial resources and an aggregate wealth of near 300,000,000,000, the nations will have cause for fear for our maneuver.

The nations will probably tremble temporarily. They will tremble until they themselves have put similar measures into operation. They will tremble only until by alliances they have restored their relative strength. Then we will be exactly where we began and the world will be camped on a field mined with deadly explosives.

It is the way of all "preparedness." It leads toward war, for it is preparedness for war and not for peace. Nations that arm themselves drive nations with conflicting interests to arms, and the more thorough the preparation of one nation the more thoroughgoing must be the organization of its possible adversaries, until with each increase in burden in the competition in armaments a point is finally reached when the burdens become more onerous than even defeat might be, and the pressure to put the contest to an issue becomes irresistible.

There is no "adequate preparedness." Its meaning comes to depend wholly upon the strength of possible combinations of adversaries, and as the preparation must be made "adequate" to each change in the condition of the adversary there can be no stability and nothing fixed, but always an increasing competition in the burdens of alliances and armaments. All for doing a vain and useless thing.

Again, war is not merely a matter of machines and automations. The human element must not be overlooked. At last,

courage and love of country are necessary. Those who drive on and on with militaristic measures do not seem to realize that conscription does not make for love of country, that state slavery does not tend to produce intelligence, courage, and patriotism. In the long run the bravest men and the best soldiers are to be found among the freest men. Even with the world's brief experience with conscription it is demonstrated that conscript armies are not finally the most reliable. The test of a soldier is defeat. The free, the voluntary soldier, reforms and fights again, but the soldier who was driven to the trenches is freed by defeat and goes his way. The world never saw such military collapse as that which followed upon the defeat during the World War of the conscript armies of Germany, Austria, and Russia.

Therefore those who drive for conscription of men and property go forward to destroy the quality of the materials with which they would seek victory—as they sacrifice the liberties of the people for efficiency in war, they destroy the efficiency which they would promote. Conscription is not an instrument for permanent military success. Rather it is a means to final destruction and defeat.

WAR SHOULD BE OUTLAWED

I am in full harmony with those who would prevent war. I would join them in outlawing war and, failing that, in minimizing its horrors and its consequences.

War is a crime against civilization and humanity. It is the most stupendous folly of mankind. Few wars are worth what they cost, for the price of victory nearly always outruns any benefit which may be gained. Even in victory there is defeat, for in success are nearly always the seeds of eventual disaster.

War is never justified unless it be fought in defense of liberty. No people ever gained an increased measure of liberty for themselves by waging a successful foreign war. Frequently the vanquished are freed by the defeat which discredits their ruling class, and frequently conquest feeds a nation's pride in military prowess and causes the surrender of cherished liberties to the demand for more perfect organization. Defeated Germany, first to use conscript armies, substituted the rule of democracy for the autocrat, while victorious America turns toward gross materialism and submits to the indignity of conscription. [Applause.]

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOWREY].

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, as we enter upon this course of legislation with the current appropriation bill there are a number of things we would do well to consider at the start. We have been in a national campaign of late. We have been talking economy, and I think we all believe in economy. I think we all really want economy. I doubt if there is a man in this House who is not honestly in his heart in favor of economy; but it is hard for us to keep from yielding on matters of this appropriation and that. Each appropriation perhaps in itself seems small, and yet they pile up into a large sum as we yield time after time to many unjustifiable and questionable items. We yield to the solicitation of this element and that among our constituents and to this class and that. The soldier boys want certain things; the Grand Army men want certain things; the postal employees want certain things; and these things one after another come, and we yield to the demand or the appeals of this class and that, and there is where we come in at last with our extravagance, I think, in legislation. I had hoped I would have a little time to discuss this thought, but I am going to pass on, because there is one item in this bill which I opposed a year ago and want to discuss a little further to-day. That is the item of \$400,000 and a little over to be appropriated for Howard University. Now, I want to say to all alike that I challenge any man in this House from any section of the country to be any more truly a friend of the Negro than I am. I have been raised with him and been his friend from the time we played around the doorstep in our dresses, when I was small enough to wear dresses. I have worked negroes under my direction for years. I never struck one a lick in all my life. I never had any trouble with one in my life, and they know, where I live, that I am their friend and that I want the best things for them and want them to get the best things for themselves.

Only a man who has had these years of association knows just how to be their friend. My opposition to this item in this bill is not from any unwillingness that the Negro race shall have the very best opportunity to make the very best possible of themselves and for themselves. I would not be guilty of trying to shut the door of hope or close the way to progress to any man or any race of men. I am a friend to

the negro. Now, you notice I say "negro." Booker Washington, I think, pretty nearly always said "negro" and not "colored person." His successor in a speech which he made at the Lincoln Memorial dedication said "negro" all the way through, and not "colored people." I received a copy of a paper published in New York by that race called, I believe, "The Negro World" and not "Colored Man's World." And at its masthead it said that it was devoted to the progress of the "Negro" race, and not the colored race. And I use the word not because I dislike the negro or want to use a term that is unwelcome to him, but, like one of the great men of his race, I think that it is the historic name of his race and one that he ought to be taught to be proud of and rejoice in and not be taught that his ancestral name is disgraceful.

And now in regard to the appropriation for the Howard University. I stated my view last year that it was contrary to our constitutional Government—that it was really an illegal appropriation for this House to make. As I remember, only one man of those favoring the bill undertook to answer that in any way, and he undertook to answer it entirely on an appeal to precedent by saying that this Congress has been doing this for 50 years. But he did not undertake to go into our Constitution and show that it was legal to make such an appropriation. I can say in answer to the proposition, that we have no right to appropriate to Howard University.

If so, we have a right to appropriate to George Washington University. We have a right to appropriate to the two Catholic universities of this city. We have a right to appropriate to any college in my State or in yours. And if this item is germane, then I would have the right to offer a bill to appropriate so much money to the Presbyterian synodical college of my district or to the University of Mississippi, which is in my district, and it would be as germane as this is. But certainly nothing could justify a thing so extremely doubtful, from the legal and constitutional standpoint, unless it were an absolute emergency. I am not admitting that even an emergency in the matter of the education of the negro would justify this Congress in appropriating money to an institution that in no way belongs to the Government. I do not believe that even an emergency would justify it.

But let us see whether or not any emergency exists. There are in the United States 653 schools for negroes, outside of our public-school system—colleges and high schools, boarding schools, and so forth. And, by the way, of the 653 schools over 600 are in the Southern States. This is an average of 36 schools each for 17 Southern and border States. Of those schools 294 are classed as "large and important" schools, and of those 294 classed as "large and important" schools less than half a dozen are outside of the Southern States. That is, they are where the negroes are more numerous, where negro schools would be most needed, and in that part of the country where they go entirely to their own schools. Under public control—of "large and important" schools—there are 28; and of land-grant schools there are 16 classed as "large and important," and they are mostly in the Southern States.

Of denominational schools there are 507, and 220 of those are classed as "large and important." Of this 220 only 3 are in the North. Two hundred and seventeen of these large and important denominational schools are in the 17 Southern and border States, which is an average of more than 12 such schools to the State already supplied to this race, and supplied by the philanthropy of the white friends of the negro or by the negro's own generosity. Then certainly there is no special emergency. Please let me stop here to say that the data which I am now giving is taken from Department of Interior Bulletin, 1916, No. 38, on negro education.

Let me run over the list of land-grant schools for a moment. There are—

Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical, Arkansas Normal, Delaware State College, Georgia State Industrial College, Kentucky Industrial Institute, Louisiana Southern University and Agricultural and Mechanical, Maryland Princess Ann Academy, Mississippi Alcorn Agricultural and Mechanical, Missouri Lincoln Institute, North Carolina Agricultural and Technical College, Oklahoma Agricultural and Normal University, South Carolina Normal Industrial, Agricultural, and Mechanical, Tennessee Agricultural and Industrial Normal, Texas Prairie View State Normal, West Virginia Collegiate Institute.

I could read over a further list. There are, in addition to these land-grant colleges, 11 State schools, colleges, universities, or normal schools supported by the States. It seems to me that we have gone far enough into that proposition to show that there is at least no emergency, and that the opportunity exists fully outside of the Howard University for the education of the Negro race, and that we can not make this appro-

priation on any claim that there is any emergency demand for it.

I think I shall take time to read over a little further statement. Alabama has a total of 74 schools for negroes, outside of the public-school system, colleges and boarding schools, and schools private and under State management, and so forth. Of these, 40 are classed as "large and important." Arkansas has 27, 12 of which are classed as "large and important." Florida has 27, 9 of which are classed as "large and important." Georgia has 79; 39 classed as "large and important." Kentucky has 18; 7 classed as "large and important." Louisiana has 65; 14 classed as "large and important." Mississippi has 47; 24 classed as "large and important." North Carolina has 76; 34 classed as "large and important." Oklahoma has 5, of which 2 are classed as "large and important." South Carolina 61, of which 27 are classed as "large and important." Tennessee has 32, of which 16 are classed as "large and important." Texas has 30, of which 18 are classed as "large and important." Virginia has 56, of which 27 are classed as "large and important."

I think those figures demonstrate the fact that we have no need of Federal appropriations to meet an emergency to give education to the colored people. Provision is amply made and amply made outside of Howard University.

Now understand, I am not opposed to Howard University. I approve the great campaign that is being made for its private endowment. I believe it can be endowed privately. I am willing to see it done that way. I have no fight to make on the institution or on that move. But when this Congress has appropriated money that now runs into the millions, and has given it splendid equipment, and has backed it for half a century, it does seem to me that with the provisions existing for the education of that race elsewhere there is no legitimate reason why we should step over our Constitution and step over the whole question of legality and make an appropriation from the United States Treasury, from trust funds committed to us for governmental purposes, for this institution.

Now, I am very sure that in the first place the Negro race themselves are amply able to carry on this institution if they see the importance of it and really want it. Their own estimate, as recently published, is that they own \$1,500,000,000 worth of property in the United States now and that they own 22,000,000 acres of land in the United States. I "hand it to them" that they have made such splendid achievements in the accumulation of property like that. But if they are not able to endow it out of their own splendid achievements, then there is the white philanthropy to which they can always resort.

By the way, it is interesting to note what a large number of these schools of which I have spoken are supported by the philanthropy of the white people. Three hundred and fifty-four of the 653 schools existing are supported by white denominational philanthropy, by the churches of the white race, and the white race has always shown itself ready to rally to the need of the negro when it comes to philanthropy in helping him in the matter of education. Recently you noted, I guess, that in this move to raise \$2,000,000, I believe, for Hampton and Tuskegee, one banker in New York has offered to start the subscription with \$250,000 in one gift. So the thing can certainly be met by philanthropy and without the need of our voting trust funds committed to us for governmental purposes in order to maintain an institution which I do not believe any man in this House doubts would be maintained if we did not appropriate another dollar.

It would be maintained when it was left to make its appeal to philanthropy, and if the same appeal is made to the people of this country that has been made to this House there is no need for this House to respond, because the people of this country will respond. And yet I am going to say—and I ask your attention especially to this proposition, and this does not mean I am not a friend to the Negro race, as I said—there is not a man here from Chicago, there is not a man here from Indianapolis, and there is not a man here from Philadelphia who does not know that what I am about to say is a serious fact.

At a luncheon in this city, given by one of the great commercial bodies of this city, citizens approached me and a prominent Republican Congressman from far north, up next to the Lakes, on the question of the franchise for the District. Now, note that I did not make the reply. My ardent Republican friend from up on the lake coast made the reply. He said: "Well, I will tell you, LOWREY, I do not know about that." He said, "I would be very slow to vote for a measure which would enfranchise this large number of negroes in the District of Columbia. I would be afraid of such a measure when there

is such an immense negro population in the District that would come near putting our National Capital under negro domination." Now, it was not this mean southern Democrat who said that; it was one of the most prominent Republicans on that side of the House, who lives up on the lake coast. He was afraid of any proposition which would tend to put our National Capital largely under the domination of the Negro race. And with the immense population that is here now and the continued population coming, I throw this out simply as a final statement, and I want somebody to consider it seriously:

Have we a right to continue to do things that will inevitably make our Capital City more and more a Mecca for a great influx of negro population? Unquestionably, a great institution, fostered and forever kept free, forever kept abreast, and forever kept open by the National Government in the National Capital, tends to make our National Capital a great Mecca for the Negro race. I do not believe there is a man in this House from North or South, Republican or Democrat, who would say he believes that is good for the National Capital or that that is good for the Nation. I believe every man before me, if he will meet the issue squarely, knows it is not good for the National Capital and it is not good for the Nation. [Applause.] And therefore we are doing very doubtful things when we legislate to make Washington more and more a great place for the influx and gathering of a great colored population—and it is growing more and more. It is now about one-third of the population of the National City. And while we would not oppress, and while we want to do those people justice, I believe every man of us, if he will look the thing squarely in the face and be honest with his own heart, must admit that we are doing our Nation a wrong, we are doing our Capital City a wrong, and we are doing the Negro race itself a wrong every time we pass legislation that tends more and more to place our National Capital under the domination of the Negro race, if they should be given the franchise. We are perilously near that now, because there are enough to-day to hold the balance of power in almost any election, if not enough to make a majority in any election.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not continue the discussion. How much time have I left?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has five minutes.

Mr. LOWREY. I yield back the remainder of my time. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back five minutes.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, another two years' cycle has rolled around, and we have all been back to and returned from the people whom we have the honor to represent. My only purpose in mentioning the facts which I intend to put before you is to furnish an encouragement to Members to take stands, not passive but active stands, against bills which do not appeal to their consciences.

There were several proposed measures in the past session which I fought actively and vigorously on this floor. One was the proposal to turn over Muscle Shoals to Henry Ford. I did not believe that was a sound measure economically. I did not believe the people of this Government ought to bind themselves to repair, maintain, and operate those dams, gates, and locks at their own expense for Henry Ford and his corporation for 100 years. I did not believe in it, and I saw fit to fight it with all the strength there was in my being, however much I regretted opposing so many of my friends on this side of the aisle who were strongly in favor of that bill, and I hated to incur their displeasure.

I also fought the McNary-Haugen bill, which sought to create another great wasteful corporation, and I opposed it even though it was called "a farmers' bill." It was a bill which, in my judgment, would have wasted \$200,000,000 out of the Treasury. That bill also provided for \$1,000,000,000 worth of bonds which this proposed corporation was authorized to issue and which the Government, of course, would have had to pay some of these days. I saw fit to fight that measure when I represent an agricultural district. I knew that if the farmers in my district misunderstood my position on that bill or misunderstood the measure itself I would be penalized and punished for standing against legislation which was claimed to be framed for the benefit of farmers.

I also saw fit to fight from the very beginning what I considered a socialistic, communistic measure, denominated the Howell-Barkley bill, sponsored by one of the finest colleagues we have in the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. But watching our friend here for several years, I had reached the conclusion that such proposal was not in

accord with the position he had maintained for years and I could not support the bill, and I helped to fight it, and I am glad to say that those of our colleagues whom I helped in the fight defeated it. I knew at the time that if I had done wrong in this respect the people at home would not again support me.

I am glad to know that the people back home have a right to pass on us every two years. I am glad to go back to them and submit my record every two years. It is a right they have, to pass upon us and our actions here. It is a right that should never be taken away. The people make mistakes sometimes, but they have an opportunity every two years to rectify mistakes. If they defeat a Congressman wrongfully, they have an opportunity to put him back in two years, and if they ought to defeat a man, they are given the opportunity every two years to do so, and I am glad they have that right.

I went down to my district with the kind of a record I have mentioned, knowing that every feature of it was going to be submitted to the voters of my district. It was submitted to them. Do not ever imagine that this particular Member can get by without a contest. There were men in my district who would have liked to keep me in Texas and out of Congress, and every vote that I had cast here along lines which apparently would be unpopular was submitted to the people, and they passed upon every one of them, and I am glad to say that the Democratic convention in my district went on record and approved these positions taken by me.

The young man who ran against me this year also ran in the preceding campaign two years ago, then making 40 speeches, after which he withdrew just before the primary. He had been secretary of the chamber of commerce of the great city of Brownwood. He had also been secretary of the chamber of commerce in the great oil city of Ranger. Before he again entered the race this year he came to Washington and got acquainted with nearly all of you Members, going to your offices trying to gather campaign thunder against me, but I do not believe that he was very successful, and then he went back to make his campaign. He established campaign headquarters in my home city of Abilene, selected campaign committees, effected organizations in the counties, and made numerous speeches, but he failed to know even how to get his name on the ticket in some of the counties. After he had made numerous speeches, and from his intensive campaign of the district realized his inevitable defeat, he put a little notice in the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, stating he had decided he could not be elected and would not conduct his campaign any further.

The next day the Ku-Klux Klan indorsed him. I did not belong. My opponent, Mr. Albright, did belong. They did not prefer my opponent, but they indorsed him because he was a Klansman and I was not one. From Abilene, Tex., where I live, the Ku-Klux Klan mailed its statement and its ticket embracing the names of its candidates. It mailed same just a few days before the primary. Same was mailed out from Abilene, Tex., on July 19, 1924, just seven days before the election was to come off on July 28, and it had on the envelope, as the return, post-office box 858, which box is rented by the Abilene Klan of the Knights of the Ku-Klux Klan. The following is this Klan statement, with its complete Ku-Klux Klan ticket, from United States Senator down to constable, and, as stated, they saw fit to recommend my opponent, Mr. Ernest G. Albright, for Congress.

Let me read this statement and ticket:

As a Klansman you know that the Klan is not in politics, and never has been, except when it has been forced to meet the assaults of the enemy. Certainly as between its enemies and its friends the Klan stays with its friends—nothing else could or should be expected.

"Self-preservation is the first law of nature."

"Self-defense is recognized both by nations and individuals."

Therefore it naturally follows that when a man announces for office in opposition to the Klan and at the same time threatens it with destruction loyal Klansmen will meet the attack and will, if the opportunity is afforded, vote for a Klansman or one who is friendly to the Klan.

We must know our friends.

We must know our enemies.

Fully mindful of the above we have patiently and diligently investigated the entire field of candidates and absolutely know the friends and enemies of the Klan. The election of Klansmen to the office means victory for the great patriotic principles for which we stand. Our defeat means victory for those seeking our destruction.

The enemies of the Klan are waging an uncompromising war on every candidate they know to be a Klansman or believed to be in sympathy with its principles.

We are therefore inclosing with this letter a ticket containing a name of the Klansmen and those known to be friendly to the order.

Certainly Klansmen will vote as they please, but believing, as we do, that loyal Klansmen will prefer to vote for their friends instead of those who seek their destruction, we most respectfully submit the names on ticket for your serious consideration.

We will have our regular meeting at the usual place Tuesday, July 22, and hold a rally at Fair Park Thursday, July 24.

Please attend both these meetings, especially the meeting Thursday, as matters of importance will be discussed.

KLAN TICKET

For United States Senator: MORRIS SHEPPARD, of Bowie County.
For governor: Felix D. Robertson, of Dallas County.
For lieutenant governor: Will C. Edwards, of Denton County.
For attorney general: Edward B. Ward, of Nueces County.
For comptroller: O. D. Baker, Milam County.
For State treasurer: C. V. Terrell, of Wise County.
For State superintendent of public instruction: S. M. N. Marrs, of Travis County.
For commissioner of agriculture: Robert E. Sparkman, of Ellis County.
For railroad commissioner: J. C. Mason, Taylor County, six-year term; W. A. Nabors, Wood County, four-year term; Walter M. W. Splawn, Bell County, two-year term.
For chief justice, supreme court: William Clayton Wear, of Hill County.
For associate justice, court of criminal appeals: O. S. Lattimore, Travis County.
For associate justice, civil appeals, second district: Irby Dunklin, Tarrant County.
For Congress, seventeenth district: Ernest G. Albright, Eastland County.
For Senator, twenty-fourth district: Ben L. Russell, of Callahan County.
For Representative, one hundred and sixteenth district: W. S. Cummings, Taylor County.
For judge, forty-second judicial district: W. R. Ely, of Taylor County.
For district attorney: Milburn S. Long, Taylor County.
For district clerk: J. K. Fuller.
For sheriff: John Bond.
For county judge: Carlos D. Speck.
For county attorney: Thomas M. Willis or Frank E. Smith.
For county clerk: W. E. Beasley.
For county treasurer: Austin Pitts.
For tax assessor: Joe T. Perry.
For tax collector: R. A. McLain.
For county superintendent public instruction: M. A. Williams.
For surveyor: ———.
For county commissioner, precinct 1: Dave Booth.
For justice of the peace, precinct 1, place No. 1: M. C. Lambeth; place No. 2, P. B. Ford.
For constable, precinct 1: R. D. (Bob) Allen.
For public weigher, precinct 1: R. L. Young.

If you think this kind of an indorsement is not calculated to take votes away from a man, you are mistaken. If you think this organization is not strong down in my district, you are mistaken. I happen to know that some of the biggest preachers in my district belong to it. I happen to know that some of the most influential men in my city belong to it. I happen to know that one of my former campaign managers belongs to it [laughter and applause], yet the Klan was strong enough to put this indorsement of my opponent over in spite of him, although this former manager was a klegle in the organization. [Laughter.] That is how strong they were.

Let me read a little statement from my opponent which he put in the Comanche paper the week preceding the primary election. Comanche is the home city of a former distinguished Member of Congress who has twice opposed me in years past. Mr. Albright asked the voters of Comanche County to scratch my name from the ballot and put in his name, stating that he was in the race to the end.

The statement is as follows:

[From the Comanche Enterprise, July 17, 1924]

ATTENTION VOTERS

On account of some technical error my name has been left off the ballot in Comanche County for the office of Congress for this, the seventeenth district, and this is to notify my friends in Comanche County that I am in the race to the finish and will ask them to write my name on the ballot and then scratch the name of my opponent, the Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON, who is running for the fourth consecu-

tive term. I will appreciate the support of each and every voter in Comanche County. Don't forget to write my name on the ticket when you go to make out your ballot.

Yours for clean politics,

ERNEST G. ALBRIGHT,
Ranger, Tex.

The following returns, officially certified, show that only 33 persons in Comanche County complied with his very urgent request:

PRIMARY ELECTION RETURNS FOR COMANCHE COUNTY, TEX., CONGRESSIONAL RACE, SEVENTEENTH DISTRICT

To Hon. FRED COCKRELL,

Chairman Democratic Executive Committee,
Seventeenth Congressional District, Abilene, Tex.

SIR: In accordance with the requirements of law, as chairman of the Democratic executive committee of Comanche County, Tex., I hereby certify to you the official returns of all votes cast in the primary election held in said Comanche County on July 26, 1924, for the office of Representative of the seventeenth congressional district of Texas, as follows, to wit:

Votes cast for THOMAS L. BLANTON..... 4,180
Votes cast for Ernest G. Albright..... 33

To the correctness of the above I hereby certify.

N. A. PALMER,
Chairman Democratic Executive Committee of
Comanche County, Tex.

Mr. Albright claimed to be a resident of Ranger, Eastland County, Tex. For several years he had been secretary of the chamber of commerce there. The following returns, officially certified, show that he received only 1 vote in Eastland County, and that was in his home city of Ranger:

PRIMARY ELECTION RETURNS FOR EASTLAND COUNTY, TEX., CONGRESSIONAL RACE, SEVENTEENTH DISTRICT

To Hon. FRED COCKRELL,

Chairman Democratic Executive Committee,
Seventeenth Congressional District, Abilene, Tex.

SIR: In accordance with the requirements of law, as chairman of the Democratic executive committee of Eastland County, Tex., I hereby certify to you the official returns of all votes cast in the primary election held in said Eastland County on July 26, 1924, for the office of Representative of the seventeenth congressional district of Texas, as follows, to wit:

Name of precinct	Number of precinct	Votes cast for Thomas L. Blanton	Votes cast for Ernest G. Albright
Eastland.....	1	1,457	1
Ranger.....	2	414	
Tudor.....	3	8	
Sabanno.....	4	38	
East Cisco.....	5	359	
West Cisco.....	6	947	
Rising Star.....	7	393	
Desdemona.....	8	180	
Pioneer.....	9	103	
Fir.....	10	40	
Kokomo.....	11	40	
Carbon.....	12	391	
Gorman.....	13	578	
Long Branch.....	14	63	
Okra.....	15	82	
Scranton.....	16	69	
Nimrod.....	17	50	
Olden.....	18	161	
Dothan.....	19	51	
Romney.....	20	45	
Mangum.....	21	29	
Pleasant Hill.....	22	54	
Staff.....	23	48	
Cook.....	24	33	
Ranger.....	25	179	
Do.....	26	264	
Do.....	27	315	
Do.....	28	450	
Total.....		6,841	1

To the correctness of the above I hereby certify.

MILBURN MCCARTY,
Chairman Democratic Executive Committee
of Eastland County, Tex.

The following are the returns, officially certified, showing the votes cast in all of the 19 counties in my district:

CERTIFIED ELECTION RETURNS FOR THE SEVENTEENTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

I, Fred Cockrell, chairman of the Democratic executive committee for the seventeenth congressional district of Texas, do hereby certify

that the following is the official vote for Congress cast in said district in the Democratic primary election held July 26, 1924, as officially certified to me by the Democratic county chairmen of the 19 counties in said district, to wit:

County	Votes cast Thomas L. Blanton	Votes cast Ernest G. Albright
Brown.....	4,120	0
Burnet.....	2,111	0
Callahan.....	2,166	0
Coleman.....	3,001	768
Comanche.....	4,180	33
Concho.....	1,394	0
Eastland.....	6,841	1
Jones.....	4,374	6
Lampasas.....	2,271	0
Llano.....	1,719	0
McCulloch.....	2,127	389
Mills.....	1,990	0
Nolan.....	1,951	661
Palo Pinto.....	1,841	1,079
Runnels.....	3,827	0
San Saba.....	2,441	0
Shackelford.....	1,864	5
Stephens.....	1,985	1,185
Taylor.....	3,607	812
Total.....	53,810	4,930

To the correctness of which I hereby certify.

FRED COCKRELL,
Chairman Democratic Executive Committee,
Seventeenth Congressional District of Texas.

ABILENE, TEX., August 23, 1924.

After the primary election was over, a Democratic convention was held in my district. It was composed of delegates selected by the Democrats of the 19 counties of my district. They are not very dissimilar from your constituents. If you Republicans, even, were to go down there and you did not have pointed out to you which were Republicans and which were Democrats, you could not tell many of them apart by looking at them. [Laughter.] They are business men just like you are and like my colleagues on this side of the aisle. They think and act like you do in many respects. If you leave out this infernal tariff and this infernal ship subsidy and this infernal way of conducting Cabinet offices by Republican Cabinet officials, they think like you, and they act like you in many respects, and they are in favor of the same kind of legislation in many respects that you are in favor of. There is not such a very great dissimilarity. My district joins the district of my good friend and former State senator, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUDSPETH], and he can vote with you even for that infernal tariff bill and yet come back here with an almost unanimous vote from his district. I want you to notice what this Democratic convention said. I want to get before you the indorsement of the positions I have taken on the questions and the issues which have been brought before us on the floor of the House.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. HUDSPETH. My colleague voted for the infamous emergency tariff bill, did he not?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; to meet the agricultural emergency because it was the only protection possible to the producers of this nation—their only salvation. [Laughter and applause.] But I did not vote for the Fordney tariff measure that followed it. Mr. Chairman, I will ask that the Clerk read the action of said Democratic convention which met in my district on August 23, 1924, which resolution I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the Clerk will read. The Clerk without objection read as follows:

The committee on resolutions, duly appointed for the Democratic congressional convention, composed of Lloyd B. Thomas, Mrs. Laura Cook Mitchell, Dr. Lon W. Hollis, jr., R. G. Cogdell, and Judge E. N. Kirby, presented to the convention the following resolution:

Whereas, in the Democratic primary election held July 26, 1924, Congressman THOMAS L. BLANTON, of Abilene, Tex., received 53,810 votes, while his opponent received only 4,930 votes, demonstrating conclusively that said Congressman THOMAS L. BLANTON has practically the unanimous support and indorsement of his constituents: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Democrats of the Seventeenth Congressional District of Texas in convention assembled—

(1) That we do hereby heartily indorse said THOMAS L. BLANTON and his work in Congress;

(2) That we commend said THOMAS L. BLANTON for his untiring efforts in making a personal survey and investigation of expenditures made by all the various bureaus and departments of Government, and his fights to eliminate all waste and extravagance from their appropriations;

(3) That we commend said THOMAS L. BLANTON for his incessant fights against the practice of sending out free garden seeds under the franks of Senators and Congressmen, which resulted in abolishing such petty graft, thus saving to the people \$360,000 each year;

(4) That we commend said THOMAS L. BLANTON for the fearless fights he made which resulted in a law being passed by Congress preventing Senators and Congressmen from buying anything but necessary office supplies from the stationery rooms;

(5) That we specially commend the said THOMAS L. BLANTON for the uncompromising fights he has made to free the people of the United States from the unjust burden of paying a large per cent of the local civic expenses of the 437,000 people of Washington, and for his continued insistence that the ridiculous tax rate of only \$1.20 on the \$100 enjoyed by said Washingtonians at the expense of the whole people shall cease and that the Government shall pay no part of said expenses until said people of Washington shall themselves pay a reasonable rate of taxation of at least \$2.75 on the \$100, which is less than the people anywhere else in the United States have to pay, and concerning this we demand action by our Senators;

(6) We commend THOMAS L. BLANTON for his fight against the bill which sought to turn over to Henry Ford's corporation for 100 years our \$100,000,000 Muscle Shoals power plant, obligating the people to maintain and operate the dams, gates, and locks for 100 years at their own expense with no adequate remuneration therefor;

(7) We commend said THOMAS L. BLANTON as the recognized leader in Congress of the American open-shop movement, guaranteeing to every person the right to labor without being forced to join and pay dues to a union. We know him to be the loyal, dependable friend of every man who labors. We indorse the fights he has made against the provisions forced by labor leaders into the Army and Navy appropriation bills prohibiting the Government from exercising rightful supervision over the work done by its thousands of employees in arsenals and navy yards, and we demand of our Senators that they shall give him cooperation and help along this line;

(8) That we commend said THOMAS L. BLANTON for leading the fight against the pernicious Howell-Barkley bill, which sought to eliminate the public's representation at the council tables and sought to tax the public with paying \$7,000 salaries to 40 board members, allowing them unlimited employees at unlimited salaries, with no enforcement of said board's decisions; and

(9) That we commend the said THOMAS L. BLANTON for the fight he made against the McNary-Haugen bill, which was a sham and a fraud upon the farmers of America and which would have wasted a \$200,000,000 appropriation and an additional \$1,000,000,000 authorized bond issue, to have been dissipated by a corporation, and which measure undoubtedly would have placed on the Government pay roll an additional 50,000 Federal employees with little assurance of relief to farmers: And be it further

Resolved, That our Congressman is hereby assured that in his future endeavors he has the confidence, good will, and commendation of practically a unanimous constituency, who will heartily support him in all of his fights for the people.

Same was unanimously adopted.

R. W. HAYNIE,
Chairman of Convention.

Attest:

Mrs. CLYDE FULWILER,
Secretary of Convention.

Mr. BLANTON. Gentlemen, I bring these facts before you, as I say, to let you know that you need not be afraid to present issues of this kind before the people of the United States. I have been at the head of organized labor's black list. When organized labor gets up in the gallery through its high-salaried leaders and demands of us something that is not sound economically, something against the best interests of the whole people of this Government, we do not have to vote for it simply because they threaten us with defeat. When they demand anything that is proper I support it. I have never denied them support of any measure that I thought was proper. Whenever it is not selfish class legislation, when it is not detrimental to the interests of the whole people, I give it my hearty support. It is only when they demand something improper that I stand up, look them in the face, and tell them when they sit up there in the gallery that I am going to vote against them, and they can go into my district and let my people know about it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Just to show that I support proper labor measures I want to put before you the following statements from two leading organizations in Washington.

The statements are as follows:

CITY FIRE FIGHTERS' ASSOCIATION OF WASHINGTON, D. C.,
Washington, D. C., June 24, 1924.

Editor DAILY REPORTER,

Abilene, Tex.

DEAR SIR: Congressman THOMAS L. BLANTON has proven himself to be the loyal, dependable friend of every member of the City Fire Fighters' Association of the District of Columbia.

Not only did he champion and help to pass a bill giving all firemen here a living wage, but also he was the author of a measure, which he fought for until he got it approved by the committee and passed by Congress, which gives to all firemen here one day off each week in lieu of Sunday.

The 700 firemen of Washington, D. C., are all his friends, and we want Congressman BLANTON's constituents to know that we appreciate his efforts in Congress.

While he fights against all waste and extravagance, he is always willing to help meritorious legislation.

Capt. EDWARD O'CONNOR,
President City Fire Fighters' Association, Washington, D. C.

POLICEMEN'S ASSOCIATION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, D. C., June 16, 1924.

NEWSPAPERS, Abilene, Tex.

GENTLEMEN: Through you we want to express to the constituents of Congressman THOMAS L. BLANTON our appreciation of his loyal friendship and his valuable efforts in our behalf.

He gave his hearty support to our bill giving a living wage to the Metropolitan police of Washington, and he was the author of a measure granting to every policeman in Washington one day off each week in lieu of Sunday, which will be a boon we have never enjoyed before, and Congressman BLANTON fought for same until he got the committee to approve it and Congress to pass it.

We want you and his constituents to know that the 1,030 members of the Metropolitan police of Washington, D. C., highly appreciate the service your Congressman is giving the people. When he gets behind a bill you may be sure that there is no graft or waste or extravagance in it. We are his friends and he is ours, and we indorse him.

Feeling that you would be pleased to know of our feeling toward Mr. BLANTON, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

MILTON D. SMITH,
President Policemen's Association.

Mr. BLANTON. Now, we are going to have the Howell-Barkley measure before us again if newspaper reports are accurate. We will have to pass on that measure again, not with an election intimidating us but with the people's mandate against the bill staring us in the face. We are also going to have another so-called farmers' relief measure brought before us, and I hope our Committee on Agriculture will see to it when they bring in another bill before the House and seek its passage, that they will have a measure of proper relief for the farmers, and not a sham—with all due respect to the men who reported it—the McNary-Haugen bill. I hope that when the President seeks to whip in line some of our good friends over on the Republican side into giving Muscle Shoals to Henry Ford, I hope the distinguished leader of the majority will stand up there and tell the President and the country that whenever Henry Ford or any other Republican—and I say that advisedly—gets Muscle Shoals, he is going to pay dollar for dollar for it in value to the American people. We are going to have the Cape Cod subsidy up again. You have not got an election staring you in the face now. Our President recommends that we give the money over to these people. You do not have to do it unless you want to; if you do not believe in that legislation you have a right to stand up and tell the leader that you are not going to support him.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SUMMERS].

THE LONG AND THE SHORT OF IT

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, during the development of our great railroad systems innumerable unjust discriminations in passenger and freight rates were made between individuals and localities.

The interstate commerce act was passed and the Interstate Commerce Commission was created 37 years ago for the purpose of securing to all the people of the United States just and equitable passenger and freight rates, and for other purposes.

The fourth section, or rate section, of the act has been the bone of contention from that day till this. It has been amended several times. Each time the language was ambiguous. It has been the subject of much litigation. Each decision has left many questions unsettled.

This ambiguous fourth section of the interstate commerce act has largely occupied the time of the Interstate Commerce Commission during all these 37 years.

Section 4 has cost communities, railroads, and the Federal Government multiplied millions of dollars for "hearings" during this 37-year controversy.

The discriminations and violations under section 4 have cost the shippers and consumers of this country not millions but hundreds of millions of dollars.

These violations have throttled water transportation, have nullified section 500 of the transportation act, which provides that—

it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to promote, encourage, and develop water transportation, service, and facilities in connection with the commerce of the United States, and to foster and preserve in full vigor both rail and water transportation—

have made the expenditure of \$1,200,000,000 for the construction of canals and the improvement of rivers and harbors almost useless.

Till this fourth-section controversy is settled it scarcely seems advisable that we make further appropriations for water transportation.

What is the present situation? A member of the commission testifies millions of applications are now and for 13 years have been pending before the commission. Applications have been granted without hearings because of lack of time.

A few months ago a new application for more exasperating discriminations was filed and is now pending.

The object of this last application is clearly to close the Panama Canal so far as United States commerce is concerned.

THE REMEDY

What is the remedy? During the closing days of the last session of Congress the Senate passed Senate bill 2327, the Gooding bill, the purpose of which is to stop further discriminations and to save water transportation from utter destruction. This bill is now before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. We seek and believe we are entitled to immediate hearings. Since exhaustive hearings have already been held by the Senate committee, we hope our own committee will report the bill out before the holidays.

MAP AND CHARTS

The map and charts before you tell the story graphically of present discriminations and of some others sought in the pending application.

Northwestern discriminations

Dry goods, carloads, from Chicago to—	Miles	Present rate	Proposed rate
Detroit, Minn.....	613	\$1.10	-----
Steele, N. Dak.....	812	1.58	-----
Seattle, Wash.....	2,314	1.58	\$1.10

If this violation of the fourth section is permitted, Detroit, Minn., which is only 613 miles from Chicago, will pay the same freight rate that the merchant 2,314 miles from Chicago pays.

The consumers out in North Dakota will pay a higher rate than the merchant 1,500 miles farther west.

Western discriminations

Dry goods, carload, 40,000 pounds, from Chicago to—	Miles	Present rate	Proposed rate
Scranton, Iowa.....	376	\$1.11	-----
Ogallala, Nebr.....	820	1.58	-----
Portland, Oreg.....	2,262	1.58	\$1.10
Seattle, Wash.....	2,445	1.58	1.10

If the application of the railroads now pending before the Interstate Commerce Commission is granted then the merchant in Scranton, Iowa, will pay more freight than the merchant 2,069 miles further west, and the merchants of North

and South Dakota, Wyoming, Montana, Idaho, Spokane and Walla Walla, in east Washington, and Oregon will pay a higher freight rate than the merchant in Portland and Seattle.

Dry goods, carloads, from Chicago to—	Miles	Present rate	Proposed rate
Willard, Kans.....	601	\$1.10	-----
Haviland, Kans.....	749	1.58	-----
San Francisco, Calif.....	2,760	1.58	\$1.10

If this application is allowed the people of Willard, Kans., will pay the same rate San Francisco will pay for three and one-half times as long a haul.

At the present time the consumers of Haviland, Kans., and all points in Colorado and Utah are paying the same rate on dry goods as San Francisco. If this fourth section violation of the interstate commerce act is allowed, the consumers of Haviland, Kans., and Colorado and Utah will continue to pay a freight rate of \$1.58 on dry goods while San Francisco will pay \$1.10 per 100 for a haul that is 2,011 miles longer.

Southwestern discriminations

Dry goods, carloads, from Chicago to—	Miles	Present rate	Proposed rate
Greenville, Miss.....	747	\$1.10	-----
Amesville, La.....	931	1.58	-----
San Francisco, Calif.....	3,408	1.58	\$1.10

If the proposed rate is granted then the Amesville, La., merchants and consumers will pay 48 cents more per hundred for a 2,477-mile shorter haul.

Intermediate merchants in Louisiana, Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and interior California will continue to pay \$1.58 per hundred, while San Francisco will pay \$1.10—or the same rate as Greenville, Miss., which is 2,661 miles nearer Chicago.

The distance from St. Louis, Chicago, Milwaukee, Springfield, and Indianapolis to New Orleans is 203 miles greater than the distance to Meridian, Miss., yet the railroads have an application before the commission to make higher rates from those points to Meridian, Miss., than to New Orleans on 41 different commodities.

The present rate on dry goods in carloads, from Chicago to Little Rock, Ark., a distance of 634 miles, is \$1.90½ per 100 pounds.

The present rate on dry goods in carloads, from Chicago to San Francisco, a distance of 3,408 miles, is \$1.58 per 100 pounds.

For a shorter haul by 2,774 miles the people of Little Rock pay \$0.32½ more.

The present rate on dry goods in carloads, from Chicago to Pine Bluff, Ark., a distance of 677 miles, is \$1.99½ per 100 pounds.

The proposed rate on dry goods in carloads, from Chicago to San Francisco, a distance of 3,408 miles, is \$1.10 per 100 pounds.

For a shorter haul by 2,731 miles the people of Pine Bluffs will have to pay \$0.89½ more.

Southeastern discriminations

Fertilizer, in carloads, from Savannah, Ga., to—	Present rate per ton
Memphis, Tenn., 678 miles.....	\$5.29
Corinth, Miss., 588 miles.....	6.64

Corinth, Miss., for the shorter distance of 90 miles pays \$1.35 per ton more than Memphis, Tenn.

Molasses, in carloads, from New Orleans to—	Present rate per ton
Norfolk, Va., 1,093 miles.....	\$9.00
Spartanburg, S. C., 688 miles.....	11.70

Although Spartanburg, S. C., has 405 miles shorter haul than Norfolk, Va., the rate is \$2.70 a ton more.

Fertilizer, in carload lots, from Savannah, Ga., to—	Present rate per ton
Vicksburg, Miss., 632 miles.....	\$4.95
Jackson, Miss., 588 miles.....	5.63

Jackson for the shorter haul of 44 miles pays 68 cents more.

WATER TRANSPORTATION

One thing that is of especial importance to us at this time is the fact that we are called on from year to year to make additional appropriations to facilitate water transportation, and at the same time the terminal-discriminating rates are putting the water transportation practically out of business. We have spent \$1,200,000,000 for canals and harbors and for

bettering waterways. The rates that are asked for here to the Pacific coast practically eliminate commerce through the Panama Canal. The railroads contend that they must have this additional transportation in order to successfully operate their lines, whereas the additional freight that they might possibly hope to gain if they eliminate the haul through the Panama Canal would add to their tonnage only about 1 per cent.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman explain briefly how the Gooding bill will correct the evils of which he makes complaint?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. There have been several attempts to amend the fourth section of the interstate commerce act so as to make it impossible for decisions by the Interstate Commerce Commission to permit the railroads to make these rates. I am not saying that the Interstate Commerce Commission deliberately does this thing; but it seems that in endeavoring to enact language fair to the roads, so that a road that has a little additional mileage in reaching a western point may have equal opportunity with other more direct lines, the language is always ambiguous. When this has gone up to the courts, the courts have sustained the roads. Under these decisions there have been different rates on different commodities at different stations; and, multiplied, they run into the millions. The Gooding bill, it is believed, is so worded that it will not discriminate against the road that has a longer haul because of its line being a little more circuitous than another line and, at the same time, will not permit the rate making that I have been describing. The Gooding bill passed the Senate almost unanimously and is now before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House, and we are hoping to have it reported out soon.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. On the issue of the disparagement of rates, I hope the gentleman will write a former Member of Congress, Mr. George J. Kindel, of Denver, Colo., for the data and figures that he has on this subject. He spent probably the last 8 or 10 years gathering statistics upon this question, and has the most comprehensive data and tables and maps that I have ever seen on the subject.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I know of Mr. Kindel's data, but I already have more material than I can use. I am bringing this to your attention at this time because of the effort that is being made to have hearings started at a very early date and have this bill reported out, in order that the House may discuss it and take action upon it during this short session. I believe we ought to have hearings immediately and that the bill ought to be reported out by the committee before the holidays, in view of the conditions that we are pointing out here and to relieve the congestion that obtains. As I have stated, there are millions of applications that have been pending now for 13 years, and many of them have had favorable action without hearings. It is a matter of clearing up the calendar and securing justice for all concerned, as I interpret it, and not a discrimination against the coast points at all. A little fairer rate to the interior would enable that part of the country to develop. We would then spend dollars with our coast cities where we now spend pennies. I believe it is wrong to discriminate against all of this territory up here in the great northwest interior and we ought to stop it. Water transportation can not possibly become a competitive factor there. That territory belongs to the railroads. The points on the Pacific coast are bound to be the market centers from which the trade will be carried on with these interior towns and cities. The larger and more prosperous the interior communities, the greater the volume of trade. All of this interior country is backing up the coast and building up the coast cities. The intermediate territory to which I have referred should not be compelled to pay a higher rate by 48 cents a hundred. These rates place a discrimination against 1,500 miles of territory, and that makes it impossible to bring capital into that territory and develop it. We want fair play and a square deal—nothing more, nothing less. The same may be said of the intermediate territory in the Middle West. Some of the worst discriminations that I have observed are against the State of Arkansas. There are some very bad ones over in the southeastern part of the United States also.

This is a matter that concerns the whole country. As one who is interested in the transportation question, and believing that water transportation should be developed to carry the heavy freight and the slow freight, and at the same time permit the greatest possible development of the railroads for the

more rapid freight, I solicit your interest in this nation-wide question and your cooperation in securing hearings at the earliest possible date. [Applause.]

Mr. CRAMTON. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. MAPES having resumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. SANDERS of Indiana, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 10020, had come to no resolution thereon.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following personal requests:

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent,

Mr. JEFFERS (at the request of Mr. McDUFFIE) was granted leave of absence for six days on account of business in connection with his official duties.

Mr. DREWRY was granted leave of absence for four days on account of sickness.

MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR THE LATE WOODROW WILSON

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following committee to act as a committee in charge of the exercises in memory of President Wilson.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BACHARACH, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. GREEN, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee, Mr. POE, and Mr. MOORE of Virginia.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, December 4, 1924, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

610. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of all judgments rendered by the Court of Claims for the year ended November 29, 1924, the amounts, the parties, and a synopsis of the nature of claims; to the Committee on Claims.

611. A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting a report showing the typewriters, adding machines, and other similar labor-saving devices belonging to the General Accounting Office which were exchanged during the fiscal year 1924; to the Committee on Appropriations.

612. A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting a report of travel performed on official business by officers and employees of the General Accounting Office from Washington to points outside of the District of Columbia during the fiscal year 1924, giving the destination, the business on account of which the same was made, and the total expense to the United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

613. A letter from the Chief of United States Bureau of Efficiency, transmitting a report showing the publications issued by the Bureau of Efficiency during the fiscal year 1924, the cost of preparation, printing, and paper, and the total number distributed; to the Committee on Printing.

614. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting statement in detail of purchases of United States bonds and Treasury notes for the cumulative sinking fund during the fiscal year 1924 (H. Doc. No. 469); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

615. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting statement of purchases of United States bonds from repayments by foreign governments during the fiscal year of 1924 (H. Doc. No. 470); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

616. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting statements of approved expenditures under the provisions of section 8 of the first Liberty bond act and section 10 of the second Liberty bond act on account of expenses of loans through the fiscal year ended June 30, 1924 (H. Doc. No. 471); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

617. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a list of useless records in the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, Navy Department, which are no longer needed for use in connection with the transaction of public business and have no

permanent value or historical interest; to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers.

618. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting detailed statements of expenditures under the contingent appropriations for the Navy Department (civil) for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1924; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Navy Department.

619. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a statement of the proceeds of all sales of old materials, condemned stores, supplies, and other public property for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1924, deposited and covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

620. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting statement showing in detail what officers and employees of the War Department have traveled on official business from Washington to points outside of the District of Columbia during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1924; to the Committee on Appropriations.

621. A letter from the chairman of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, transmitting eleventh annual report of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia for the year ended December 31, 1923; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

622. A letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting the annual report of the Comptroller of the Currency covering activities of the Currency Bureau in the year ended October 31, 1924; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

623. A letter from the Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau, transmitting report of typewriters and other labor-saving machines purchased in exchange during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1924; to the Committee on Appropriations.

624. A letter from the Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau, transmitting a report of traveling expenses incurred by officers and employees of the central office of the United States Veterans' Bureau traveling on official business outside of Washington during the fiscal year 1924; to the Committee on Appropriations.

625. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting statements from 12 offices and bureaus of the Treasury Department showing in detail what officers and employees performed travel on official business from Washington to points outside of the District of Columbia during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1924; to the Committee on Appropriations.

626. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report of The Adjutant General of the Army relative to the administration of the World War adjusted compensation act so far as the War Department is concerned; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

627. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting detailed report of the expenditures under "Preventing the spread of epidemic diseases" for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

628. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a combined statement of the receipts and disbursements, balances, etc., of the Government during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1924 (H. Doc. No. 465); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, with accompanying papers.

629. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting statement showing claims for refund approved by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1924, and forwarded to the disbursing clerk of the Treasury for payment or to the General Accounting Office for direct settlement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

630. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report of expenditures on account of appropriation "Contingencies of the Army" during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924; to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department.

631. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting two tables showing the cost and other data with respect to Indian irrigation projects as compiled to the end of the fiscal year June 30, 1924; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

632. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting statement of fiscal affairs of Indian tribes for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1924; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

633. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting statement of expenditures for the fiscal year 1924 from the appropriation "Industry among Indians, 1924," act of August 1, 1914 (38 Stat. L. 586); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

634. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting report for the fiscal year 1924 showing the amounts expended at each Indian school and agency from the appropriation for construction, lease, purchase, repair, and improvement of school and agency buildings; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

635. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting report of expenditures for the purpose of encouraging industry among the Indians of the various reservations during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1924, from the appropriation of \$100,000 under the act of June 30, 1913 (38 Stat. L. 77-81); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

636. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1924, relating to the appropriation, "Indian schools, support, 1924"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

637. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting report of labor-saving devices purchased for the Department of the Interior during the fiscal year 1924; to the Committee on Appropriations.

638. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting report of expenditures for the purpose of encouraging industry and support among the Indians on the Tongue River Reservation, Mont., during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1924; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

639. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting statement of expenditures from the tribal funds of the Chipewa Indians of Minnesota for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1924; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

640. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting report of expenditures for the purchase of cattle for the Northern Cheyenne Indians on the Tongue River Reservation, Mont., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1924; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

641. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a statement of expenditures on account of the Indian Service for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1924, from the appropriation "Industrial work and care of timber, 1924"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

642. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting report of expenditures from the permanent fund of the Sioux Indians during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1924; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

643. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting detailed report of expenditures from the \$250,000 authorized from the funds of the Apache, Kiowa, and Comanche Indians for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1924; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

644. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting report of all moneys collected and deposited during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1924, under the appropriation "Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1924"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

645. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a detailed report of expenditures from the tribal funds of the Confederate Bands of the Utes during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1924; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

646. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting report showing the diversion of appropriations for the pay of specified employees in the Indian Service for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1924; to the Committee on Appropriations.

647. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a statement of the expenditures for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1924, of money carried on the books under the caption "Indian moneys, proceeds of labor"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

648. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting statement of travel expenses incident to the detail of employees from the office of one surveyor general to another during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1924; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

649. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting statement of cost of survey and allotment work, Indian Service, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1924; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

650. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting report showing that no expenditures were made during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1924, for the construction of hospitals from the appropriation, "Relieving distress and prevention of diseases among the Indians"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

651. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting statement showing the receipts from rentals, extension of Capitol grounds, for a period from December 1, 1923, to and including November 30, 1924; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

652. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting report on the claims of members of the Sioux Nation of Indians residing in the State of South Dakota for horses killed on the Cheyenne River Indian Reservation in the years 1895, 1896, and 1897, which horses are alleged to have been erroneously suspected of being infected with glanders; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

653. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting report of the disbursements of the proceeds of the public lands to the more complete endowment and support of the colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

654. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting detailed statement of receipts and expenditures on account of pay patients admitted to Freedmen's Hospital for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1924; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

655. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting detailed statement of expenditures for professional and other services in the Freedmen's Hospital for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1924; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

656. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting detailed report showing the names of all persons employed, their designations, and rates of pay, in the Bureau of Animal Industry, for the suppression of contagious, infectious, or other communicable diseases of domestic animals, during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1924; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture.

657. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting report giving in detail the aggregate number of publications issued by the Department of Agriculture during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1924, together with the cost of preparation, paper, and printing of each publication and the number of each distributed; to the Committee on Printing.

658. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting detailed statement of the manner in which the appropriation "Miscellaneous expenses, Department of Agriculture, 1924," has been expended; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture.

659. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture transmitting report of all labor-saving devices exchanged during the fiscal year 1924 in part payment for new machines; to the Committee on Appropriations.

660. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting statement showing the cost of maintenance, operation, and repair of all motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles and motor boats owned by the department and operated outside of the city of Washington during the fiscal year 1924; also a report of the motor-propelled or horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles or motor boats purchased by the department during the fiscal year 1924; to the Committee on Appropriations.

661. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting report of sale of paper no longer needed for public business, receipts for sale of this useless paper for the fiscal year amounting to \$2,669.85; to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers.

662. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting report of contributions on account of cooperative work with the Forest Service and the amount refunded to depositors on account of excess deposits, national forests fund, for the fiscal year 1924; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture.

663. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting report of sums of money allotted to the Bureau of Chemistry that were used for compensation of or payment of expenses of officers or other persons employed by State, county, or municipal governments; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture.

664. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting report of revenues derived from the operation, and expenditure made on behalf of, the Center Market, Washington, D. C., during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1924; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture.

665. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a statement showing in detail the travel, from Washington to points outside of the District of Columbia, performed by officers and employees (other than special agents, inspectors, and employees who in the discharge of their regular duties are required to constantly travel) of the Department of Agriculture during the fiscal year 1924; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FREDERICKS: A bill (H. R. 10139) to establish an extension to the transcontinental Air Mail Service from Salt

Lake City, Utah, to Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 10140) to punish the counterfeiting of Government transportation requests; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROACH: A bill (H. R. 10141) to amend an act approved December 23, 1913, as amended by an act approved March 3, 1919, known as the Federal reserve act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10142) to extend the provisions of the pension act of May 11, 1912, and subsequent acts amendatory thereof to the Enrolled Missouri Militia and other militia organizations of the State of Missouri that cooperated with the military or naval forces of the United States in suppressing the War of the Rebellion who served 90 days or more, and providing pensions for their widows, minor children, and dependent parents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWING: A bill (H. R. 10143) to exempt from cancellation certain desert-land entries in Riverside County, Calif.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 10144) to amend an act entitled "An act to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan police force, the United States park police force, and the fire department of the District of Columbia," approved May 27, 1924; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BURTON: A bill (H. R. 10145) to authorize the settlement of the indebtedness of the Republic of Poland to the United States of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAILE: A bill (H. R. 10146) to amend certain sections of the World War veterans' act, 1924, pertaining to Government life insurance; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. CURRY: A bill (H. R. 10147) to create a department of aeronautics, defining the powers and duties of the Secretary thereof, providing for the organization, disposition, and administration of a United States air force, and providing for the development of civil and commercial aviation, the regulation of air navigation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 10148) extending to inhabitants of Hawaii the provisions of subdivision b of section 9 of the act of October 6, 1917, as amended; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 10149) to amend the World War veterans' act, 1924; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ALMON: A bill (H. R. 10150) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River at or near the city of Decatur, Ala.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DEAL: A bill (H. R. 10151) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a Federal building at Boykin, Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GASQUE: A bill (H. R. 10152) granting the consent of Congress to the Huntley-Richardson Lumber Co., a corporation of the State of South Carolina, doing business in said State, to construct a railroad bridge across Bull Creek at or near Eddy Lake, in the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROACH: A bill (H. R. 10153) for the erection of a Federal post-office building at the city of Eldon, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10154) for the erection of a Federal post-office building at the city of Centralia, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: A bill (H. R. 10155) for the purchase of a site for a public building at Littleton, Arapahoe County, Colo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10156) for the purchase of a site for a public building at Loveland, Larimer County, Colo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 10157) to acquire a site and erect a public building at Derby Line, Vt.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GARNER of Texas: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 300) extending the time during which certain domestic animals which have crossed the boundary line into foreign countries may be returned duty free; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: Resolution (H. Res. 370) extending the time for rendering the report of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation to February 15, 1925; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Resolution (H. Res. 371) to print the manuscript entitled "Hearing on the proposed child labor amendments to the Constitution of the United States"; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALDRICH: A bill (H. R. 10158) granting an increase of pension to Sarah C. Webb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ARNOLD: A bill (H. R. 10159) granting an increase of pension to Joseph E. W. Bergbower; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10160) granting a pension to Olive Griffin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BEERS: A bill (H. R. 10161) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Evaline Hammon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 10162) granting a pension to Mary Fitchett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 10163) granting a pension to Edgar M. Riggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10164) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Scobey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10165) granting a pension to Frank Isgrigg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10166) granting a pension to Anna C. Tonnemacher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10167) granting a pension to Mary E. Scudder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10168) granting a pension to James K. Waltermire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10169) granting a pension to Mary E. Eubank; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOK: A bill (H. R. 10170) granting a pension to Lita Bahr; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10171) granting a pension to Emily J. Hormel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRISP: A bill (H. R. 10172) granting an increase of pension to Mattie Hepler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10173) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. William R. Lebert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10174) granting an increase of pension to Garbin Patrick; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DEAL: A bill (H. R. 10175) to place Capt. Herbert L. Lee on the retired list of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10176) to extend the benefits of the employers' liability act of September 7, 1916, to James Robert Allen; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10177) granting six months' pay to Virginia Weaver Plonk; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 10178) granting an increase of pension to Nellie J. Wyrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FAUST: A bill (H. R. 10179) granting a pension to Thomas H. Savage, alias William Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10180) granting an increase of pension to William Thomas Bond; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FISHER: A bill (H. R. 10181) to reinstate in the naval service Joseph W. Peete, jr.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 10182) for the relief of the estate of EHjah Abbott; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FREE: A bill (H. R. 10183) granting a pension to Frances M. Armstrong; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10184) granting a pension to Melissa Kitchen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 10185) granting an increase of pension to Carrie Miller; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 10186) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Cummins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GERAN: A bill (H. R. 10187) granting an increase of pension to William A. Hankinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GLATFELTER: A bill (H. R. 10188) granting an increase of pension to Annie Hoover; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10189) granting an increase of pension to Julia N. Sheely; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10190) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Morningstar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10191) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Hale; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10192) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ellen Myers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10193) granting an increase of pension to Jane W. Rohrbaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10194) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Zeigler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10195) granting an increase of pension to Justina Womner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10196) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Householder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10197) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Ness; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10198) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Hoffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIEST: A bill (H. R. 10199) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 10200) granting an increase of pension to Priscilla DeWitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10201) granting an increase of pension to Minnie V. Main; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10202) granting an increase of pension to Nancy J. Ross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10203) granting an increase of pension to Hezekiah C. Oetner; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10204) granting an increase of pension to Mary Emily Stanberry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10205) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Gray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10206) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Ellen Fisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL: A bill (H. R. 10207) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Eaton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KETCHAM: A bill (H. R. 10208) granting a pension to Frances A. Burdsal; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEE of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 10209) granting an increase of pension to John A. Petty; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: A bill (H. R. 10210) granting a pension to Minnie E. Banks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOZIER: A bill (H. R. 10211) granting an increase of pension to James W. Fisher; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10212) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Fisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10213) granting an increase of pension to William T. Lamme; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10214) granting an increase of pension to Amanda Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10215) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Kuhn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10216) granting a pension to Robert T. McElhiney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10217) granting a pension to William M. Silver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10218) granting a pension to Eunice Catherine Dearing; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10219) granting a pension to Sarepta Richards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10220) granting a pension to Daniel Wesley Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10221) granting a pension to Catherine Cowhick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10222) granting a pension to William W. Alverson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10223) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Burton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKEOWN: A bill (H. R. 10224) granting an increase of pension to Hattie A. Frazier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10225) granting an increase of pension to Jane Grant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10226) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Nixon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10227) granting an increase of pension to Eliza J. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10228) granting an increase of pension to Zoe Rodd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 10229) granting an increase of pension to Risby Jane McLaughlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McREYNOLDS: A bill (H. R. 10230) granting an increase of pension to John A. Brammett; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MERRITT: A bill (H. R. 10231) granting a pension to Dora E. F. Terhune; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10232) granting a pension to Edna F. Verity; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10233) granting an increase of pension to James M. Burns; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10234) granting an increase of pension to Mary Eliza Brewster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10235) granting an increase of pension to Emma L. Jimmerson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10236) granting an increase of pension to Sophia J. Bartram; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 10237) granting a pension to Eldora Temple; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10238) granting a pension to Margaret Diehl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10239) granting an increase of pension to Anna Cochran; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10240) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Lilly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10241) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca M. Reese; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10242) granting an increase of pension to Sarah L. Murphy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10243) granting an increase of pension to Susan V. Rogers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'BRIEN: A bill (H. R. 10244) for the relief of William Winterbottom; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 10245) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Reeves; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10246) granting an increase of pension to Grandville A. Henry; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 10247) granting a pension to Rosetta Connelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: A bill (H. R. 10248) granting an increase of pension to Ann E. Pike; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10249) granting an increase of pension to Luttia Neff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROACH: A bill (H. R. 10250) granting a pension to Addie Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10251) granting a pension to Catherine D. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10252) granting a pension to Nancy J. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10253) for the relief of Alfred Mason; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ROBSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 10254) granting a pension to James M. Cawood; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10255) granting a pension to Nancy C. Patrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROGERS of New Hampshire: A bill (H. R. 10256) granting a pension to Margaret E. McCarthy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10257) granting an increase of pension to Ida Paquette; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10258) granting an increase of pension to Arophine C. Knox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10259) granting an increase of pension to Esther Huntress; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHREVE: A bill (H. R. 10260) granting a pension to Helena Dearborn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10261) granting a pension to Mary E. Grey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPROUL of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 10262) granting a pension to Lester Swanberg; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STRONG of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 10263) granting an increase of pension to Aroline H. Atwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10264) granting an increase of pension to Bert Myers; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THATCHER: A bill (H. R. 10265) granting an increase of pension to Mattie P. Gilbert; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 10266) granting an increase of pension to Martha J. Keeler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WATRES: A bill (H. R. 10267) granting an increase of pension to Edward Sweeney; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3065. By Mr. ALDRICH: Petition of Department of Rhode Island, Veterans of Foreign Wars, favoring increase of pay and allowances of men in Army bands, the commissioning of band leaders, and the designation of band leaders as band commanders; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3066. By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: Papers accompanying House bill 10037, granting an increase of pension to Robert L. Chick; to the Committee on Pensions.

3067. By Mr. FREDERICKS: Petition of citizens of Pasadena, Calif., praying that doctors practicing drugless methods of health be added to the staff of hospitals treating disabled veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

3068. Also, petition of citizens of Los Angeles, Calif., remonstrating against the passage of Senate bill 3218; to the Committee on Education.

3069. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Massachusetts Civic League, Boston, Mass., recommending early and favorable consideration of House bill 5195, which provides for the establishment of a probation system in the United States district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3070. By Mr. HAWLEY: Petition of citizens of Lane County, Oreg., opposing the enactment of Senate bill 3218; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3071. By Mr. KIESS: Petition of citizens of Potter County, Pa., protesting against the passage of Senate bill 3218; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3072. By Mr. KINDRED: Petition of the Prison Association of New York, recommending the erection in New York of an institution for the detention of Federal prisoners both before and after conviction; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3073. By Mr. O'CONNELL of New York: Petition of the Regular Democratic Organization of the Twentieth Assembly District of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the postal salary increase bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3074. By Mr. O'CONNELL of Rhode Island: Petition of Cumberland Post, No. 14, American Legion, Department of Rhode Island, in favor of equalizing pay of Army and Navy musicians; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3075. By Mr. PHILLIPS: Affidavits to accompany House bill 10099, granting a pension to Kate Stanton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3076. Also, affidavits to accompany House bill 10098, granting a pension to Victor Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3077. By Mr. ROUSE: Petition of 207 citizens of Kenton County, Ky., against the passage of Senate bill 3218 or any religious legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3078. By Mr. VARE: Petition of Army and Navy Union, United States of America, Capt. Charles V. Gridley Garrison, No. 4, Erie, Pa., urging that an increase of pension be granted to veterans of all wars and their dependents; to the Committee on Pensions.

SENATE

THURSDAY, December 4, 1924

(Legislative day of Wednesday, December 3, 1924)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

PROPOSED GIFT BY ELIZABETH SPRAGUE COOLIDGE TO THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a letter from the Librarian of Congress, submitting an offer from Mrs. Frederic Shurtleff Coolidge to build an auditorium in connection with the Library of Congress. Without objection, the letter will be printed in the Record, and it will be referred to the Committee on the Library for consideration. The communication is as follows: